1-1-1982

Factors affecting a staff development team approach for secondary school improvement.

Geraldine Ann O'Donnell
University of Massachusetts Amherst

FACTORS AFFECTING A STAFF DEVELOPMENT TEAM APPROACH FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

A Dissertation Presented

By

GERALDINE ANN O'DONNELL

Submitted to the Graduate School of the University of Massachusetts in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF EDUCATION

May 1982

Education

FACTORS AFFECTING A STAFF DEVELOPMENT

TEAM APPROACH FOR SECONDARY SCHOOL IMPROVEMENT

A Dissertation Presented

By

GERALDINE ANN O'DONNELL

Approved as to style and content by:

Dr. Richard J. Clark, Chairperson

Dr. Horace Reed, Member

Dr. William Field, Member

Mario Fantini, Dean
School of Education

D E D I C A T I O N

To my Parents and M. L. R.,
my first teachers.

To Kathleen D. Lyman, a master teacher
to many and a mentor to me.

To R. W. S., who teaches from the heart.

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

This dissertation is the result of the cooperation, work, and support of many people. My sincere thanks go to the members of my dissertation committee who helped to make this experience both challenging and enjoyable over the last four years.

Specifically, I wish to express my appreciation to:

Dr. Richard J. Clark for serving as Chairperson of both my comprehensive and dissertation committees and whose enduring support and timely advice motivated me to pursue this study;

Dr. Horace Reed for providing a balance of intellectual rigor and humanistic support in both his classes and in committee conferences and who helped me to re-think, re-write, and refine this work;

Dr. William Field for supporting my efforts to study the Boston Public School System and whose political perspectives provided an added dimension to this educational study.

Special thanks to Dr. Judithe Speidel whose critical review of both the dissertation proposal and the final draft of this study provided invaluable assistance in the task of re-writing and editing.

I also wish to acknowledge the contribution of my co-interviewer, Mary Schatzkamer, whose assistance with the methodology was most helpful in both the formulation of the interview questions and the process of interviewing.

I also wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Atron Gentry, Dr. William Fanslow, Dr. Robert Peterkin, Dr. Brunetta Wolfman, and all other faculty members of the School of Education whose enduring commitment to helping the Boston Public Schools have made the Boston Secondary Schools Program possible. And a special thanks to the support staffs in both Boston and Amherst for their gracious assistance.

A special acknowledgement is due to my professional colleagues in the Boston Public Schools who generously gave me their time and their thoughtful analyses of their experiences in this Program. Without their cooperation this study would not have been possible. It is hoped that this study will bring some recognition of the professional caliber of many people in the Boston Public Schools.

I wish to express my gratitude to my beloved Family for their love and support in all my endeavors and particularly during this study. And to my friends for their belief in me.

Finally, a special acknowledgement to my sister, Susan K. O'Donnell for her professional assistance in the typing and preparation of this study. And to the law firm of Bradley, Barry and Tarlow of Boston for their generosity in providing me with technical assistance on the final draft.

A B S T R A C T

Factors Affecting A Staff Development
Team Approach For Secondary School Improvement

May 1982

Geraldine Ann O'Donnell, B.A., University of Massachusetts, M.A., Boston State College, Ed.D., University of Massachusetts

Directed by: Doctor Richard J. Clark

The problem of this study is to identify what sets of conditions increase the probability of the effectiveness of a team model for secondary school improvement and what conditions hamper team effectiveness during the first year of a team approach to school problem-solving. The project under study, known as the Boston Secondary Schools Program, is a collaboration between the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts and seven Boston Public Schools. Each participating school formed a team consisting of both teachers and administrators with the principal generally functioning as team leader. The objective for each school-based team was to identify school problems and work together to solve those problems. Faculty members from the School of Education facilitated team efforts at weekly meetings.

During the first year of the Program (1980-1981), six high schools and one middle school participated in this collaboration. There were seventy-five teachers who formed teams of various sizes with their principals. At the end of the academic year, a qualitative evaluation was conducted to identify the factors necessary for effective problem-solving teams in schools. Eight sources of data were analyzed including in-depth interviews, participant observations, and questionnaires. Findings conclude that five factors are necessary for the effective functioning of teacher-administrator teams working in collaboration with University faculty. These are:

1. The organizational structure and perception of local autonomy of the school;
2. The leadership of the team and of the school;
3. The composition of the teams and sharing of resources;
4. Team norms for communication and interaction styles;
5. Goals or purpose of the teams for individuals, for the school, and for the Program.

An elaboration and clarification of these factors using supportive data form the basis of this dissertation study of the first year of implementation of this collaboration between public school practitioners and School of Education faculty.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT v

Chapter

I. INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY 1

Statement of the Problem 6
Significance of the Study 8
The Context of the Study 15
The Federal Court Order 16
Magnet Schools 17
University Pairings 19
The Year of This Study. 21
Footnotes 27

II. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE 31

Introduction 31
Theoretical Rationale 32
Organizations: The Changing of the Bureaucratic Model 48
The Public School as Bureaucracy 55
Schools and the Process of Change 61
Leadership and the Role of the Principal . . 67
School Improvement Studies 79
Organizational Development Applied to Schools 88
Collaboration and Teams 88
Footnotes 99

III. PROGRAM DESIGN AND OPERATION 107

The Development of the Team Concept 107
Program Operation 110
Purpose of the Study 114
Delimitations of the Study 116
Operational Definitions 116
Footnotes 119

IV. METHODOLOGY 120

Introduction 120
Subjects 121
Measurements and Procedures 121
The Interviews 121
Interviewer Qualifications 122
The Interview Questions 123

Selection of Participants in the Interview Process 124
Methods of Recording 125
The Questionnaire 126
Method of Distribution 127
Program Documents 128
Participant Observation 128
Analysis of the Data 129
Footnotes 131

V. THE TEAMS 132

Organization of the Chapter 132
School A 134
School B 146
School C 159
School D 165
School E 175
School F 181
School G 189
Questionnaire Data 197
Introduction 197
Questionnaire Results 199
Open-Ended Question Results 200
Participant Profiles 202
Leadership Data 203
Footnotes 206

VI. THE CONCLUSIONS 207

Introduction 207
Clarification of the Conclusions 209
A Force Field Analysis of Team Variables . . 232

VII. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS 238

Recommendations 239
Specific Recommendations for School Teams . 243
Recommendations for Further Research 245
Summary 246
Conclusion 248
Footnotes 252

. . . . . .

BIBLIOGRAPHY 253

APPENDICES 262

C H A P T E R I

INTRODUCTION: BACKGROUND FOR THE STUDY

School improvement strategies have been based on several assumptions over the last hundred years. One assumption is that school problems are caused by certain inadequacies on the part of staff members; for example, the use of outmoded instructional strategies or outdated curriculum content. The solution has been to design one or a series of inservice workshops to introduce new ideas to educators with the hope that they will consequently improve their classroom techniques. The objective for many typical inservice workshops is cognitive change, but increasing individual knowledge does not necessarily lead to behavioral changes. In fact, such sessions can often lead participants to cling defensively to old behavior.[1] Research studies substantiate that very little transfer of new teaching skills occurs when teachers are provided with inservice workshops.[2]

One reason for this failure proposed by educational researchers is the exclusion of the teacher in the planning and development of new methods and materials.[3] As Massachusetts Education Commissioner Gregory Anrig pointed out at a recent seminar on the subject, inservice workshops have been something done <u>to</u> you.[4] There is increasing

evidence that suggests that more is gained with professionals by building on strengths than by always searching for inadequacies or by utilizing remedial approaches.[5]

Another assumption often included in the design of inservice or staff development projects is that the needs of administrators and teachers for professional growth are different. Therefore, separate workshops and programs are designed for each group. Staff development projects for administrators propose to improve their managerial skills and often use consultants from business schools. The collaboration between the Harvard Business School and the Boston Public Schools to provide summer training for all headmasters (secondary principals) in 1977 is an obvious example of this approach. Although administrators certainly need some training in fiscal management, these workshops tend to minimize their role as instructional leaders in their school.[6]

Perhaps the most fundamental assumption of school improvement strategies which must be challenged is the idea that people working in organizations can be changed without changing the organization itself. There is a growing body of research on the nature of organizations, the ways in which they change, the ways they affect the people who work in them, and the ways in which work can be improved, not

only in the quality and quantity of outcomes, but also in the quality of life for the people who work in them. The work of Chris Argyris and Donald Schon[7], Warren Bennis[8] and other social scientists has contributed substantially to the literature on the nature of organizations. Educational researchers such as Philip Runkel and Richard Schmuck[9] and many professionals associated with the work of the National Training Laboratory have been applying organizational theories to the schools. Generally referred to as Organizational Development, these theorists maintain that organizations which integrate the individual's needs for growth and development with the goals and objectives of the organization will be more successful and productive and also will be healthier environments for people. Collaboration is reinforced as a norm in such organizations and power is shared through various strategies which help to reduce hierarchical domination, such as participatory decision-making, ongoing problem-solving, and conflict utilization.

This study will analyze the theories of Organizational Development and defend the position that these theories are appropriate to the schools as organizations, and, in fact, may be necessary to their survival in this post-industrial era. One school improvement project will be analyzed in depth and will be used to demonstrate the application of

Organizational Development principles in a school intervention program. This program, known as the Boston Secondary Schools Program, is a collaboration between the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts and seven Boston Public Schools. Although the collaboration has developed over several years, the design of the program for the academic year under study, 1980-1981, has incorporated many Organizational Development strategies such as a team approach to school problem-solving, teams consisting of both teachers and administrators, and provision for weekly open forum meetings among participating schools to encourage communication, resource sharing, and trust building. These and other Organizational Development concepts were studied through the use of several research modes: in-depth interviews with program participants; analysis of questionnaire data; participant observation of combined team meetings and videotapes produced by the teams; and an analysis of program documents such as required course papers written by participants.

The School of Education of the University of Massachusetts began working with the Boston Public Schools in 1975. Initially working with the English High School, the project focused on staff development for school change by offering graduate degree programs to teachers and

administrators. Courses were also offered to help school personnel to fulfill certification requirements or to improve teaching skills such as "Teaching Reading in the Content Area." As the collaboration matured, a Teacher Center was developed and the project emphasis shifted from meeting the needs of individual teachers to programs designed to have an impact on more people at the school.[10]

The dialogue between the Boston school personnel and the faculty from the University expanded to other schools as English High School staff members were promoted or transferred to other Boston schools and as more schools became aware of the extent of the University services. During the Fall semester of 1979, a planning seminar was conducted for the headmasters of the interested schools. With Dean Mario Fantini as chief consultant, the headmasters and the University faculty from the School of Education developed a set of position papers. These papers became the basis for the major school improvement project which was implemented at six Boston high schools and one middle school during the school year, 1980-1981.

As the program abstract states, "the Boston Secondary Schools Program supports individual school efforts in the analysis, planning, implementation, and evaluation for the purpose of enhancing student outcomes."[11] The program emphasized a team approach to school problem-solving. Each

participating school had a team consisting of several teachers from various disciplines with the headmaster functioning as the team leader in most cases. The objective for each school-based team was to identify school problems and work together on plans of action to seek solutions to those problems. A team of six faculty members from the School of Education met in Boston each week with all the school teams together. In addition, school-based teams were also required to meet at their respective schools. All headmasters and team leaders also met on a weekly basis as an administrator support group to evaluate the progress of their respective teams and plan future activities for the collaboration. All team participants paid tuition and received graduate credits for their involvement on the teams. Some participants were enrolled in advanced degree programs including doctoral studies. A sharing and critiquing of position papers and other degree work was encouraged among participants. Another unique feature of the program design was a two day "mini-sabbatical" held on the Amherst campus for all participants during each semester.

Statement of the Problem

Although all teams share a general goal of working

together to improve their schools, variability is characteristic of many other aspects of the program. Teams were initiated at different intervals and both the nature and history of their relationship with the collaborating agency, the School of Education, have varied. In some schools, the headmaster was the team leader, while in others the role was taken by a teacher with the headmaster as a team member. And in two of the schools, the headmasters were not participants in the program. Leadership styles varied greatly among the team leaders and headmasters. Headmasters also had different perceptions of the importance of the work of the teams. Also, schools varied in the nature and scope of the problem which they chose to work on. The method of choosing a problem differed: some were chosen by the headmaster/team leader while others were decided by group consensus. One team had a general topic with individual members working on their own sub-topics. The work of the teams at their home schools was different: some met several times a week, some less often; some during the school day and some after school.

Thus the problem of this study is to identify what sets of conditions increase the probability of the effectiveness of this team model for school improvement and what conditions hamper team effectiveness during the first year

of implementation. Through a qualitative analysis of the effects of these factors in operation during the first year of the team approach, this study will clarify and elaborate on the set of conditions necessary for reaching positive outcomes using a team approach to school problem solving.

Significance of the Study

A major challenge for education in the decade of the 1980's is the dilemma posed for management in a period of decline. As pupil enrollments decline, buildings close, and teaching staffs are reduced, educators will be responsible for providing more services to fulfill the needs of an increasingly complex student population. In periods of growth, errors of judgment can be assuaged by more resource allocation. Multiple priorities can be addressed and career advancement can motivate people to work harder. In periods of decline, solutions to problems are stymied by a fear of failure which cannot be afforded; job consolidation can devastate staff morale; and priorities must be reduced to a bare minimum.[12] In addition to these pressures, certain realities of the post-industrial era impinge on the schools. The complexity of these realities makes our past assumptions of how to run things hopelessly obsolete. The paradigm of the

bureaucracy with its rigid hierarchical structure, its singular leadership, top-down communication flow, and general waste of human potential which was so successfully adopted by school systems in the last century cannot respond to society's needs in this new era.[13] No longer can we assume that the leader of an organization can find the answers alone to the problems facing that organization. No longer can we assume that experts can instruct and thereby improve the performance of our educators. School staff members must begin to work together as professionals, as colleagues, not only to improve their schools, but also their profession and the way their work is viewed and valued by the society at large.

The organization of the secondary school is fraught with debilitating aspects. The lack of professional interaction, the rigid hierarchical norms governing the relationship between principals and teachers, the insecurity over job performance and results have been documented in many sociological studies.[14] Psychologists and physicians are now documenting the mental and physical price being paid by teachers and administrators for attempting to work under these stressful conditions in many studies of the "burn-out" syndrome.[15] Unless there are major changes in the norms governing the relationship between administrators and teachers and teacher

interaction, there will continue to be great losses to the profession. National statistics reflect the consequences of stress on school personnel. A recent teacher opinion poll revealed that one-third of those teaching now wouldn't go into teaching if they could go back to college and start again. And only six out of ten said that they plan to remain in teaching until retirement. The number of teachers with 20 years or more experience has dropped by nearly half in the past 15 years according to a recent report by Willard McGuire of the National Educational Association.[16]

In his sociological study of schoolteachers, Lortie concluded that there should be a variety of opportunities for voluntary collaboration among professionals in the schools including more shared and less top-down authority in the schools, more principals who stress their roles as instructional leaders rather than middle management administrators, more creative approaches to scheduling to allow for more time for peer coaching among teachers in their classrooms.[17]

The president of the National Education Association, Willard McGuire, stated recently that teacher burnout was a major new malady that has afflicted the teaching profession.[18] Although many causes are related to the societal changes which have a negative impact on the

schools such as the decrease in parental involvement in the schools and the increase of violence and crime in the schools, one possible cure in the schools' control is the promoting of collaboration among teachers and principals.[19]

The principals are also isolated from their peers and many argue that they have been reduced to middle management messengers between central office staff and teachers. The Wall Street Journal in an article on "Teacher Burnout" labeled principals "low-level bureaucratic robots at the beck of legislators, parents, and pressure groups."[20] The relationship between teacher job satisfaction and the leadership of the schools is being documented by many researchers. Goodlad found that job satisfaction, particularly in high schools, related strongly to principal leadership and patterns of problem-solving and decision-making.[21] In a report entitled The Battered Teacher, a medical doctor who treated a number of teachers for stress and trauma found many had an attitude of defeatism caused by poor leadership. Those who reported inadequate administrative support also reported low school morale and a high incidence of physiological and psychological complaints among the faculty. The report concluded that sharing was one method of prevention and control of stress and trauma, and that teachers need

opportunities to help one another, especially in working through the violent events they encounter.[22]

Sharing of resources and skills as well as problems encountered helps to reverse teacher burnout but positive feedback and reinforcement are also crucial. The building of self-esteem is also important. One recent essay by an industrial psychologist suggests adopting the Japanese practice of a godfather; that is, placing a person in charge of newer employees to inspire, to teach, to act as a guardian.[23] Another way to build esteem would be to find ways in the organization of the school to capitalize on the specialized talent or expertise of members of the faculty. In his list of the causes of stress from several different groups of teachers, Alschuler found a lack of teacher input into decision-making and feelings of powerlessness as causes of stress.[24] As the educational leaders of the schools, principals must recognize the negative implications of their style of leadership on themselves and their staffs. They must reconsider the role of teachers in the management of the schools.

If the roles of the principals and teachers in the schools are to change and their relationships improve, then it is the organization of the school itself which must be analyzed and changed. The systemic causes which prevent change must be examined. Kurt Lewin was one of the first

to point out that the morale of individuals in an organization is not explicable by their situation at a given time but is heavily affected by their "psychological future" and to a lesser extent by their past.[25] In recent studies in California, Bentzen's data on schools suggests that the way in which organizational conditions are perceived may directly or indirectly affect how work is performed.[26] And Rosabeth Moss Kanter, studying the larger bureaucracies of the corporate world, cited the negative effects of work on people when they work in organizations of limited opportunity where the rigid bureaucratic models of task organization and communication prevail and maintain the gap between the administrator and the worker. In such organizations, she argued, there will be large groups of disadvantaged and underemployed workers which can be a source of behavioral blockages and recurrent organizational problems.[27] Argyris argued that to ignore the satisfaction of human needs in the work place leads to students and staff increasingly removing themselves from serious work. His findings indicate that organizational structures that require a formalization of rules, feature strong specialization of tasks, and are run by authoritarian styles of management reduce opportunities for feelings of individual competence, feelings of companionship among employees, and feelings of power over

one's own fate. Argyris says that the cost to the organization is found in increased absenteeism, noninvolvement, and even sabotage.[28]

Although there is little direct evidence from schools to support the application of these findings to schools, many studies have shown that humanizing the workplace has positive factors for all levels of workers. A study by Daniel Yankelovich showed job satisfaction and meaning to one's work which were traditional demands of the white collar worker are increasingly heard as the demands from blue collar, high school educated workers.[29] Organizations of the future must be structured to integrate these individual needs with the needs of the organization. As Bennis pointed out, the organization form that will gradually replace the bureaucracy will be an adaptive, problem-solving system of diverse specialists linked together by coordinating executives in an organic flux.[30] Future situational features will be characterized by the overarching feature of change itself. The pivotal role of the leader will shift from a sole concern with the substantive to an emphasis on the interpersonal and organizational processes. He further argues that, if it is true that professionals tend to seek such rewards as full utilization of their talents and training, professional status and opportunities for

development and further learning, then a "good place to work" will resemble a super-graduate school.[31] If this vision is desirable for the corporate model, it is eminently applicable to our school systems.

This vision of a dynamic organization in which all members participate in on-going professional and personal development with a self-conscious focus on examining and improving the organization itself is the philosophical underpinning for the design of the Boston Secondary Schools Program. Translating this vision to the environment of the public secondary schools is an enormous task specifically in the Boston School System in the academic year 1980-1981. A review of the political, economic and social events in the city, the Commonwealth and the nation is necessary to the understanding of the historical context in which this study took place.

The Context of the Study

No study undertaken in the Boston Public Schools can ignore the incredible series of historical events which form the backdrop of the story of the last ten years for the schools. As facts are recalled, particularly those of the academic year of this study, 1980-1981, the reader must keep this historic perspective, especially when reviewing

the findings of this study. It was in the midst of a major fiscal crisis which threatened to close down the entire system, in the scandal of a corrupt school committee member, in the tensions generated by imminent threats of personnel layoffs, in the obstacles of a bus strike, and in the constant public outcry and media reports of the failure of public education in the city and in the nation that seventy-five teachers and their administrators worked to improve their schools by participating in the Boston Seconday Schools Program. That they could envision any chance at effecting positive change at all is a tribute to their professionalism and their idealism.

To understand the changes facing participants in the Program, significant events such as the Federal Court Desegregation Order of 1974, the Phase II Court Order of 1975, which created magnet schools and school-university pairings, and the specific political and economic events of 1980-1981 must be reviewed to understand the problems and the potential of a design for school improvement such as the Boston Secondary Schools Program.

The Federal Court Order. The significance of this study of teacher/administrator teams increases substantially when viewed against the backdrop of the recent events of the Boston Public Schools. The most pervasive change for the schools in the decade of the seventies was the decision of

Judge W. Arthur Garrity, Jr. of the United States District Court in Massachusetts. Black parents and their children had brought suit against the Boston School Committee and others for violating their constitutional rights by persistent segregation practices in the Boston Public Schools. On June 21, 1974, Judge Garrity ruled in favor of the plaintiffs, stating his court order that:

> the evidence established that the school authorities had knowingly carried out a systematic program of segregation affecting all of the city's students, teachers, and school facilities and had intentionally brought about or maintained a dual school system; that the entire school system of Boston was unconstitutionally segregated; . . . that the School Committee would be permanently enjoined from discriminating on the basis of race in the operation of the Boston schools, and that they would be ordered to formulate and implement plans to secure for the plaintiffs their constitutional rights.[32]

Magnet Schools. During the school year 1974-1975, the first year of the implementation of the desegregation order, Judge Garrity approved the initial plan that required students to be bused from various schools to achieve racial balance. The plan simply called for students of one predominant race to be transported to a school of another predominant race. Violent neighborhood disturbances were telecast across the nation as viewers

watched dismal scenes of adults attacking school buses. Schools were ringed with the Tactical Police Force and state troopers and "South Boston" became just as symbolic of racial strife as Selma or Little Rock.

The next school year, a more complicated court order was issued from Judge Garrity's bench. Known as Phase II, this order reorganized the school system into eight districts, cutting across the city in such a way as to insure that a mixed racial composition could be drawn for attendance at the district schools. A unique feature of Phase II was the creation of a city-wide district known as District Nine which would be composed of "magnet" schools. Students and parents from any neighborhood in the city could volunteer to attend these magnet schools. The schools were given educational themes which would act as a magnet to draw a diverse student population. It was the intention of the Court to not only give parents and students some possibility of choice in their school assignments but also to demonstrate that schools of quality could be racially balanced and peaceful. City-wide magnet schools were located in all parts of the city and included both new and established schools such as: Boston Latin and Latin Academy and Boston Technical High Schools, all three of which operated as exam schools and were therefore already city-wide schools; English High School, the oldest

public high school in the country, now designated as the magnet school of the performing arts; and Madison Park High School, a new school located on a college campus-type facility in Roxbury and designated as the Music Magnet.

University Pairings. An important part of Phase II of the federal court order was the setting up of partnership or pairings between the schools and the colleges in the greater Boston area. Local businesses were also paired with the schools as the Judge and his court-appointed experts attempted to build a support system of community resources for the beleagured schools. These triangular partnerships were "to provide technical assistance and special programs to improve the quality of education in the city schools."[33] Funding for these programs was supplied by the Commonwealth of Massachusetts' Board of Education under Chapter 636.

It was during this period that plans were being made to form a collaboration between the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts and one Boston high school, the English High School. This collaboration was not part of the Federal Court Order but rather the result of a series of conversations in the past between the former dean of the School of Education, Dwight Allen, and former school superintendent, William Leary. They conceived of a

collaboration between one Boston high school and the School of Education which would bring researchers and practitioners together for mutual benefit. No action was taken on this plan until new leadership at both institutions began a dialogue in 1975 about the feasibility of such a collaboration. At this time, the English High School was besieged with problems beyond but not excluding the racial strife upsetting Boston schools. Dr. Robert Peterkin was recruited from out of state as new headmaster and he invited the School of Education to collaborate on improving the school. Dr. Richard Clark, Associate Dean of Program Planning and Development, met with members of the English High School faculty and by the next year, a collaborative program was developed which focused on staff development through graduate courses taught by University personnel on the school site and designed to meet the expressed needs of the teaching and administrative staffs. Under the leadership of Dr. Clark, the collaboration won the prestigious American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Award in 1978 and became the basis for the Boston Secondary Schools Program.[34]

Activities of the other court pairings involved University consultations at the matched schools, enrichment activities for students to increase opportunities for integration, and the hiring of ancillary personnel for the

schools. Although fraught with sporadic street demonstrations and school disturbances, the schools developed a certain stability toward the end of the seventies under the leadership of Dr. Robert C. Wood as Superintendent.

The Year of This Study. A chronology of the school year 1980-1981, the year of this dissertation study, shatters the image of peaceful and painstaking rebuilding for the Boston School System. This year also saw headlines deriding public education in favor of privatism,[35] as legislators in the nation's capital, empowered by a sympathetic President, called for support of private education and the voucher system.[36] Voters in the Commonwealth endorsed Proposition 2 1/2, a tax revenue limiting statute which drastically cuts into the funding source for public education, the property tax, and strips school boards of their local autonomy.[37]

For Boston, the dwindling support for public education was reduced even more by a year of political scandal and fiscal disaster. At the beginning of that school year, the University of Massachusetts faculty from the School of Education were preparing to implement a new approach to collaborating with the Boston Schools. After a year of planning with several headmasters and other Boston

administrators, the University announced a school improvement project which would call for the formation of school-based teams composed of teachers and led by headmasters from the participating schools.[38] The teams would work together on identifying school-wide problems, develop plans of action and evaluate their efforts according to a timetable devised by them to reach their goals. The plan called for a year-long commitment from the participants who would receive graduate credit from the University for their work. University faculty would interact with the teams as facilitators and would bring all teams together once a week for a team "course." On August 21, 1980, headmasters and other team leaders from the seven participating schools met with the University faculty at the President's Office of the University of Massachusetts. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss the implementation of the team concept when the schools opened on September 2, 1980. As the meeting adjourned, local news stations announced the firing of Superintendent Robert C. Wood by the Boston School Committee, just twelve days before the opening of schools. This shock was only the first wave in a series of events that would cause the system to lurch from one crisis to the next. In the following historical context of that school year,

approximately seventy-five teachers and seven headmasters worked on school-based teams to improve their schools:

- August 22, 1980 - Paul A. Kennedy is named interim superintendent.

- September 4 - Mayor Kevin H. White tells the School Committee he will hold the budget at $195 million instead of the $236 million requested by the School Committee.

- September 24 - School Committee President John McDonough warns that, in the absence of a budget increase, immediate massive lay-offs or the shutdown of the system by March are the only alternatives.

- September 25 - The School Committee refuses to accept White's budget ceiling and decides to continue spending at its current level.

- January 31, 1981 - Massachusetts Education Commissioner Gregory Anrig says the city school system will run out of money by March 13.

- February 4 - City Auditor Newell Cook notifies the School Committee that the system may be a week away from running out of money. He warns that payrolls will be frozen after February 13.

- February 5 - A reprieve keeps the schools open until the end of February.

- February 24 - White announces that the School Department now has enough money to stay open until March 30 but then will have to close. The School Committee votes to close 27 Boston schools this summer in an effort to save $8 million next year.

- March 3 - White submits a proposal to release $18 million to keep the schools open.

- March 13 - The School Committee approves $3 million in spending cuts, including 250

layoffs aimed at reducing the school system's spending for the year to $240 million.

- March 19 - City Auditor Cook writes the School Committee that without additional revenue, funds for the schools will run out about April 17.

- March 24 - The State Board of Education files suit in Superior Court to force the city to keep the schools open for 180 days.

- March 26 - Acting School Superintendent Paul A. Kennedy dies of a heart attack. Deputy Superintendent Joseph M. McDonough is named to replace him.

- April 3 - School officials tell the City Council they now need an additional $38 million, instead of $30 million previously sought, to be sure of keeping the schools open until June 19.

- April 10 - The City Council approves a redrafted borrowing plan, with $38 million earmarked for the schools.

- April 14 - White rejects the council's bill and submits a new draft of his own, which calls for making $18 million available to the schools while stripping the School Committee of much of its power. The State Senate votes $9.4 million in state aid for Boston that White says he will transfer to the schools if it wins final approval.[39]

On the last day of that school year, June 21, 1981, a journalist summarized the year as follows:

> One thousand of the 4500 teachers are scheduled to be laid off. The city's teachers shuffled about, threatened with layoffs and worried about their contract, are dispirited. In the past year, they had three superintendents, a school committeeman - turned extortionist, a three week bus strike, and five months of worrying whether the

> system would stay open for 180 days. 500 teachers were reassigned at least twice, 1000 at least once. Stability was a rumor, a memory. From August when the School Committee fired Superintendent Robert Wood with two years left on his contract, the system reeled from one crisis to the next. On the same October day that Committee man Gerald O'Leary was charged with attempted extortion of $650,000.00 from a transportation company (he was later convicted), blacks and whites hurled chairs at each other in the worst outbreak at South Boston High School in four years. Then the [bus] drivers walked out for three weeks, paralyzing a system that depends on forced busing. Though reading scores jumped dramatically during this year, the caprices of the system have rendered moot its benefits. As it is, only one Boston family in 10 has a child in a public school. Citywide enrollment, already a third less than it was a decade ago, will probably drop from 63,500 to under 60,000 students.[40]

In addition to the constant threat of payless paydays and school closings, many teachers faced the possibility of being laid off for the following school year, even if they made it through this year. In order to insure that the next school year the School Department would stay within its budget ceiling, the acting superintendent directed that 1000 teachers and administrators be sent notices that they would not be re-hired for the next school year. During the data collection phase of this study in the Spring of 1981, many teachers and administrators participating in the University team program received such notices. It is a testimony to their professionalism that they were

continuing their work on the teams, meeting after school,coping with problems in the schools, supporting one another in this endeavor, and indeed, participating in the collection of data for this study.

Footnotes

[1]Richard A. Schmuck et al, The Second Handbook of Organizational Development in Schools (Oregon: Mayflower Publishing Company, 1977), p. 3.

[2]Bruce Joyce and Beverly Showers, "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research," Education Leadership II (February 1980), pp. 379-385.

[3]Mary Bentzen et al, Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principal (New York: McGraw Hill Publishing, 1974); Paul Berman and Milbrey McLaughlin, Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Volume VIII: Implementing and Sustaining Innovations (Santa Monica, Calif.: Rand Corporation, 1978); John Goodlad, Facing the Future: Issues in Education and Schooling (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976), p. 192; William G. Knox, Power on Pawn: Leadership and the Department Head. A Resource Booklet Ontario: ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 153 309, 1977), p.8.

[4]Gregory Anrig, "Rethinking Inservice Education" Boston University Conference, (April 3, 1980).

[5]Leslie J. Bishop, Staff Development and Instructional Improvement: Plans and Procedures (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976).

[6]Dan Lortie, Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975); Karen Pick "Curriculum Implementation and the Role of the Principal: A Study of the Elementary Schools in one District of Boston" (Ed.D. Dissertation; University of Massachusetts, 1980).

[7]Chris Argyris and Donald Schon, Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesly Publications, 1978); Chris Argyris, Intervention Theory and Method (Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1970).

[8]Warren Bennis, ed. The Planning of Change: Readings in the Applied Behavioral Sciences (New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961); Warren Bennis, Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evaluation of Human Organizations (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966); Warren Bennis, American Bureaucracy (New Jersey: Alding Publishing Company, 1970).

[9]Schmuck et al, Second Handbook.

[10]Philip Stec, "Staff Development: Approaches in Theory and Practice" (Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1978); Margaret Fraher Le Gendre, "Mechanisms for Secondary School Change: A Case Study of the English High Teachers' Center" (Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts, 1979).

[11]See Appendix A for the complete Program Abstract.

[12]William Keough quoted in Diane Divoky, "Burden of the Seventies: The Management of Decline," Phi Delta Kappan (October, 1979) p. 88.

[13]Eric Trist, "Collaboration in Work Settings: A Personal Perspective," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science vol. 13, no. 3 (Arlington, Va.: NTL Institute for Applied Behavioral Science, 1977), p. 268.

[14]Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching (New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1932); Lortie, Schoolteacher.

[15]Alfred Alschuler ed. Teacher Burnout Analysis and Action Series (Washington, D.C., National Education Association, 1980).

[16]Ibid., p. 10.

[17]Lortie, Schoolteacher, p. 90.

[18]Alschuler, Burnout, p. 6.

[19]Ibid., p. 66.

[20]Claradine M. Johnson, The Principal in the 1980's: Instruc-Leader, Manager, quoting "Teacher Burnout," Wall Street Journal (July 25, 1979), p.20.

[21]John I. Goodlad, What Schools Are For (Los Angeles: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1979), p. 85.

[22]Alschuler, Burnout, p. 25.

[23]Ibid., p. 39.

[24]Ibid., p. 66.

[25]Theodore Caplow, Principals of Organization, (New York: Harcourt Brace & World, 1964), p. 268.

[26]Mary M. Bentzen, Richard C. Williams, and Paul Heckman, "A Study of Schooling: Adult Experiences in Schools," Phi Delta Kappan (February, 1980), pp. 394-397.

[27]Rosabeth Moss Kanter, Men and Women of the Corporation (New York: Basic Books Inc., 1977).

[28]Chris Argyris, "Personality and Organization Theory Revisited," Administrative Science Quarterly, Vol. 18, 1973, pp. 141-167.

[29]Daniel Yankelovich, "Turbulence in the Working World: Angry Workers, Happy Grads," Psychology Today, Vol. 8, (December, 1974), pp. 80-82.

[30]Bennis, American Bureaucracy, p. 165.

[31]Ibid., p. 170.

[32]Judge W. Arthur Garrity, The Boston School Decision (Boston: The Community Action Committee of Paperback Booksmith, reproduced from Volume 379, No. 2 of the Federal Supplement Dated October 21, 1974).

[33]Arthur J. Gartland, Chairman, City-Wide Coordinating Council, Facts About the Phase II Desegregation Plan in Boston: 1975-1976 Academic Year (Boston: City-Wide Coordinating Council, n.d.).

[34]See Philip Stec, "Staff Development: Plans and Procedures" for an elaboration of the history of this collaboration.

[35]In the 10 years beginning with 1970, the number of non-public schools belonging to the National Association of Independent Schools rose from 718 to 809. In that same period, the number of students increased from 241,500 to 315,400. (Muriel Cohen, "Studying Problems, Planning Improvements," Boston Globe (July 9, 1981), p. 32.

[36]Muriel Cohen, "Public Schools. Does Anyone Care?" Boston Globe (July 5, 1981), p. 1.

[37]Muriel Cohen, "2 1/2 Feeds Interest in Private Schools," Boston Globe (December 15, 1980), p. 21.

[38]See Appendix B.

[39]"The School Year in Review," Boston Globe (May 2, 1981), p. 24.

[40]John Powers, "Hub School Year Was Touch and Go," Boston Globe (June 21, 1981), p. 1.

C H A P T E R I I

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

The focus of this research study is a staff development model for secondary schools which uses a team approach to solving problems in the schools. Known as the Boston Secondary Schools Program, the model is a collaboration between the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts and the seven Boston Public Schools. Although collaboration projects between schools of education and public schools are not unique as models to affect change in schools, this program design is based on research findings on organizations as well as the growing body of research on change specific to schools. Rather than the more traditional collaboration model based on university courses aimed at staff development for school improvement, this collaboration model is based on the establishment of a team at each participating school which consists of both teachers and administrators who work together as colleagues to identify school problems and work on possible solutions. The faculty from the School of Education interact with the teams on a facilitative basis, rather than as instructors. This design was a result of

research findings on school change and organizational change as well as the result of experiences which have evolved from the association of the intervention agency, the School of Education, and the Boston Public School System. A review of the literature pertinent to an analysis of this program therefore requires an examination of the following research areas:

1. Theoretic Rationale: Organizations as bureaucracies and the development of organizations in the post-industrial era;

2. Schools as bureaucracies and strategies for school change;

3. Organizational Development strategies applied to schools

    a. Collaboration studies
    b. Teams
    c. Leadership styles and teams

Theoretical Rationale

The Boston Secondary Schools Program is a collaboration project between seven Boston public schools and the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts. Although its broad goal of school improvement is not unique to most collaborative models, its team design renders it almost revolutionary, compared to many other staff development projects aimed at school improvement. The team concept

brings teachers and administrators together to identify problems in their schools and provides them with a structure for participatory decision-making, the hierarchical relationship between teachers and administrators is reduced through group processes which also provide opportunities for shared leadership. Also, through the group processes of the teams, school problems can be viewed more as organizational issues and team meetings can provide an environment to stimulate a critical self-examination of the school as an organization which can change. Increased opportunities for professional interaction can lead to a humanizing of the workplace and therefore greater satisfaction for the workers. Through this model of staff development, public school personnel can begin to take advantage of the growing body of research on organizations, their characteristics, and the ramifications of those characteristics on the people involved with them.

Schools as organizations have changed along with the society they serve, moving from village schoolhouses to complex bureaucracies based on corporate models and the growing needs of an industrial society.[1] Indeed, educational reform movements at the turn of the century called for the application of the principles of Frederic Taylor to the administration of the school, running with

the efficiency of the railroads and mills. Powerful school boards with superintendents as executive directors would oversee all aspects of the operation of the school. Ideas or suggestions from teachers should be as the "deferential advice of the dutiful daughter to her father," while administrators were compared to "drill sargeants."[2] The classic sociological study of Willard Waller, The Sociology of Teaching, written in 1932, clearly documents the negative outcomes of the rigid hierarchy, particularly between teachers and principals, in terms of the relationship between them as well as their relation to the community and the development of a teacher stereotype which is something of a caricature.[3] A more recent study by Dan Lortie found teachers' lives marked by three essential qualities: they are "presentists," in that they seek psychic rewards from their day-to-day classroom activities; they are conservative, preferring to do things the way they have always been done; and they are individualistic.[4] Despite differing goals for entering the profession, the majority expressed similar tensions, stating that they were uncertain of what they were accomplishing. Lortie concludes his study by calling for more forms of collegiality for teachers, more shared and less topdown authority in the schools, more principals who conceive of themselves as heads of teaching staffs, more opportunities

in schools for people to collaborate voluntarily. Sarason reaches similar recommendations in his study of the school culture and advocated the establishment of "resource networks" in which teachers could overcome one of the obstacles for school change which is characteristic of school culture: the lack of vehicles for discussion, communication, or observation of actual teaching which might foster help and change for the teachers and the schools.[5]

The model of the bureaucracy is receiving critical attention from many social scientists, not just for schools, but also for the corporations which spawned its structure into a modern paradigm for our society. When this organizational model was conceptualized by Max Weber, it was envisioned as a rational, routinized approach to the regulation of human enterprise. Weber characterized the bureaucracy as follows:

1. There is the principle of fixed and official jurisdictional areas, generally ordered by rules; that is, laws or administrative regulations.

2. The authority to give commands required for the discharge of duties is distributed in a stable way and is strictly delimited by these rules concerning the coercive means, physical, sacerdotal, or otherwise which may be placed at the disposal of officials.

3. The regular activities required for the purposes of the bureaucratically governed structure are distributed in a fixed way as official duties.

4. Methodical provision is made for the regular and continuous fulfillment of these duties and for the execution of the corresponding rights; only persons who have the generally regulated qualifications to serve are employed.[6]

For Weber, the model of the bureaucracy was "the means of carrying 'community action' over into rationally ordered 'societal action'."[7] The bureaucratic model rested upon "technical superiority" and was seen as an instrument for "societizing relations of power." The one who controlled the bureaucratic apparatus had a power instrument of the first order, according to Weber, and could control societal actions by a methodical ordering which would be superior to resistence from the "mass" or even "communal action."[8] It is a vision of rational control over the ever-moving environment, a prescription for a "fixed route of march" which can control that environment through a functional specialization of work.[9]

Although this paradigm responded to the needs of an industrialized, mechanistic society and helped redirect an agrarian system, it is being challenged today as an outmoded model for the post-industrial era which we have entered.[10] In 1960, Douglas MacGregor stated that "the textbook principles of organization - the hierarchical structure, authority, unity of command, task specialization, division of staff and line, span of control, equality of responsibility and authority, -

comprise an armchair speculation not based on empirical research, yet are presented as if they are beyond challenge."[11] At the beginning of the next decade, Warren Bennis analyzed the American bureaucracy and found the following problems: "arbitrary and zany rules; an underworld (or informal) organization which subverts or even replaces the formal; cruel treatment of subordinates based not on rational or legal grounds but upon inhumanity.[12] Organizations, he argued, are primarily complex, goal seeking units. In order to survive, they must also accomplish the secondary tasks of maintaining their internal system and coordinating the "human side of enterprise" by a process of "mutual compliance or reciprocity and by adapting to and shaping the external environment for adaptability," according to Bennis. If, as Caplow argued, organizations are "first and forement interaction networks,"[13] then the organizational model of the bureaucracy with its dependence on a highly competitive, undifferentiated and stable environment, its pyramidal structure of authority, and its rigid norms governing interactions between superordinates and subordinates and line and staff personnel, cannot meet the needs of the post-bureaucratic society.[14] The needs for this post-bureaucratic society call for interdependence not competition, working in an environment of turbulence, not

stasis, and led by leaders who are "coordinators or linking pins between various task forces."[15] The organizational form which will replace the bureaucracy is, according to Bennis, one in which "adaptive, problem solving temporary systems of diverse specialists, are linked together by coordinating executives in an organic flux."[16]

The new organizational model must therefore be proactive and interactive with its environment rather than prescriptive or reactive. This means that the organization must be capable of adaptation, or learning. Theorists such as Chris Argyris and Donald Schon argue that organizations can learn to break through the static pyramidal structure and critically analyze their norms through a process which they refer to as "double-loop learning." Most organizations have no problem with single loop learning in which an error is detected and corrected. But if the detection reveals an underlying organizational norm which should be examined, most organizations back off from this double-loop and in fact have unspoken rules about how to handle this situation so that the norms and structures are not called into question. Yet it is exactly in the deeper norms and structures of schools and other bureaucracies that change must begin.[17]

While Argyris postulates that organizations must move in the direction of double-loop learning, or critical

self-examination of rigid norms, Eric Trist and others argue that a redesign of conventional organizations is mandatory for the successful survival in a post-industrial world. Trist analyzes four types of contextual environments. The first two are referred to as "placid" and prevailed in pre-industrial societies where the change rate was slow. The third environmental type is called the "Disturbed-reactive" and reflects the accelerated change rate which developed as the industrial revolution progressed. After World War II, when the science-based industries arose in the wake of the knowledge and information explosions, the disturbed-reactive character arose from the fact that the best chance of survival went to the large-scale organizations with the capacity for formidable competitive challenge through their expertise and power. The competitive and singular technocratic bureaucracy was the organizational form which was perfected at this time. Trist continues by pointing out that the very success of the technocratic bureaucracy has given rise to a newer environment in which this organizational form is mismatched. This fourth environment he refers to as the "turbulent field" in which large competing organizations, all acting independently, in many directions, produce unanticipated and dissonant consequences on the overall environment. The environment characterized by the

turbulent field has a high level of interdependence, a higher level of complexity, and together these generate a much higher level of uncertainty. The current organizational model of the technocratic bureaucracy with its independent purposes, its competitive relations, its mechanistic and authoritarian control structure, and its tendency to debase human resources, cannot absorb environmental turbulence, far less reduce it.[18] Trist takes the position that redesign of the bureaucratic paradigm is mandatory for survival. The new design must involve a process or organizational development that includes work restructuring and should include a planning process that is interactive and participatory. These processes must have an adaptive capacity in order to deal with the new levels of interdependence, complexity, and uncertainty. Collaboration rather than competition is the basic requirement, as fundamental to the successful building of a post-industrial order as competition was to the building of an industrial order.[19]

Rosabeth Moss Kanter, in her study, Men and Women of the Corporation, analyzed the processes of the contemporary corporate world and also concluded that collaborative structures were necessary to improve conditions in the organizations for managers, subordinates, and the organization itself. What is needed, she concluded, is an

increase of power, not in the sense of hierarchical domination, but in the sense of having the ability to get things done, to mobilize resources, to forge alliances and use whatever it is that a person needs for the goals he or she is attempting to meet. Empowering more people, in Kanter's sense, gives people more control over conditions that make their actions possible and therefore, more gets accomplished for the individual as well as the organization.[20]

One of the approaches suggested by Kanter to empower staffs is for managers or administrators to study the structure of their organizations and pay particular attention to the structures of opportunity and power in the whole system. An analysis of opportunity and power can provide guidelines for the kinds of programs and arrangements that will broaden access to favorable positions in the organization. A revision of the present organizational structure and its practices, including job redefinition and design, modifications of the hierarchy, and more flexibility of opportunity to participate in decision making, can result in increasing the total capacity for effective action, including increased production.[21]

In his study of the dynamics of interpersonal behavior in organizations, including bureaucracies, Zaleznik

concluded that the effectiveness of large-scale organizations was related to the development of small groups, their level of group cohesion, and ability to solve internal problems.[22] But the existence of small groups within the organization does not imply that they will be effective for the organization, indeed, in the case of the rigid bureaucracy, they can exist as the informal "underworld" referred to by Bennis. The challenge to leaders of organizations is to discover the conditions beyond spontaneity which have an impact on small groups so that their dynamics can be maximized for the organization. As Zaleznik points out, most small groups in organizations have an impact on group requirements. For example, the problem solving group will require the utmost in conscious collaboration and coordination of individual activities. In addition to group identity, small groups also evolve their own structure, differing roles, rituals and symbols, and norms governing rewards and punishments.[23] They can be the center of the influence process on individuals. Kurt Lewin, in his study of group dynamics, showed this tendency for individuals to change more readily as members of a group rather than attempting a behavioral or attitudinal change alone:

> Many social habits are anchored in the relation between individuals and certain

> group standards; i.e., the group level itself acquires value . . . one might expect single individuals to be more pliable than groups of like-minded individuals. However, experience in leadership training, in changing food habits, work production, criminality, alcoholism, prejudices, all indicate that it is usually easier to change individuals formed in a group than to change any one of them separately.[24]

In addition to the importance of the development of a group identity based on purpose, there is an equally important development of the group identification with the leader. Zaleznik, referring to the classic statement of Freud on the function of the leader in the emotional life of the group, states that the withdrawal of the leader figure or abandonment of him or her as an object for identification, breaks the attachment and induces anxiety. The leader's values are adopted by the group and behavior becomes a model for them.[25]

Leadership in the group and indeed in the organization as a whole has an effect on the functioning of small groups. A review of the assumptions underlying MacGregor's Theory X and Theory Y can demonstrate that the values or assumptions underlying leadership styles can have a tremendous philosophical and operational impact on how a leader interacts with individuals and small groups which form the human resources of an organization. Theory X assumes that: (1) the average human being has an inherent

dislike of work; (2) therefore, most people must be controlled, directed, or threatened to get them to achieve organizational goals; and (3) the average human being prefers to be directed, wishes to avoid responsibilities, and has little ambition and wants security above all. In contrast, Theory Y generalizes that man is a wanting animal and as one need is satisfied, another appears. Thus, man is continually putting forth effort, i.e, working to satisfy needs. A satisfied need is not a good motivator of behavior. As physiological and safety needs are met, man seeks the next level, social needs. Next are the egoistic needs which relate to one's self-esteem, self-respect, and self-confidence, as well as those which relate to one's reputation such as the need for status, recognition, and respect. Self-fulfillment, or realizing one's own potentialities for continued self-development is the highest achievement, according to MacGregor.[26]

The development of these contrasting assumptions regarding the individual and the organization developed historically along with the study of effective managerial approaches to individuals and organizations. As Bennis shows, in the early part of this century (1910-1935) the theories of scientific management postulated by Weber and Taylor seemed to presume that organizations existed as if they were without people. Around the period from 1938 to

the 1950's, the "human relations" approach regarded people but not the organization they were members of. Since that time, however, the "revisionists" such as Selznick, Whyte, Likert, and Zaleznik are working to revise the human relations claims which are unsubstantiated while at the same time re-examining the benefits to this approach of the management of human resources.[27]

It is in this context that behavioral scientists are examining theories of planned change, the role of the change agent, small groups, and the training of leaders and members of organizations for the improvement of these organizations in the post-industrial era. In a recent essay, Kenneth Benne stated that it is important for the effective maintenance and extension of democratic values in our society that persons and groups be trained in the stimulation and development of planned change in social patterns and human relations. Educators particularly must be trained in ways of stimulating and guiding change which incorporates the democratic norms as basic elements of their operating methodology.[28] Benne elaborates on five democratic norms which should be incorporated as methodological norms in any planned change.

1. The engineering of change and the meeting of pressures on a group or organization toward change must be collaborative; i.e., across the lines of divergent interests to a common interest, and

across the lines of "theory" and "practice." A planned change in a school situation must be one which is based on the best available knowledge of relevant relationships and structures, of social forces and factors promoting and impeding various possible changes, of the consequences likely to result from alternative lines of action proposed and considered. The development of the skills of productive collaboration by practitioners, representatives of various "interests," and consulting social scientists sets a central goal for educational leadership which is devoted to the democratization of change processes.

2. The engineering of change must be educational for the participants. Individuals need to learn the skills of contribution to collective thinking. Groups need to learn the skill of eliciting effective individual contributions to group thinking from all members. And organizations need to develop an atmosphere which permits individuals and sub-groups to mature and communicate effectively their unique contributions to organizational change and improvement.

3. The engineering of change must be experimental as well as "research-minded."

4. The engineering of change must be task-oriented; i.e., controlled by the requirements of the problem confronted and its effective solution, rather than oriented to the maintenance or extension of the prestige and/or power of those who originate contributions. The task of training persons and groups to achieve effective communication across barriers of prestige and differential power is far from easy. This is nowhere more difficult than in educational change where the status barriers between teachers (workers) and supervisors and administrators must be taken into account.

5. The engineering of change must be anti-individualistic, yet provide for the establishment of appropriate areas of privacy and for the development of persons as creative units of influence in our society.[29]

The Boston Secondary Schools Program contains the seeds for great change in the way schools as organizations function. There are opportunities for the sharing of power, or at least more access to power. As cooperative interactions increase among staff members, opportunities increase for a sharing of resources. The behavioral norms governing the traditional relationship between teachers and administrators are replaced or at least challenged by the team model which fosters colleagiality. As the teams engage in organizational problem-solving, they develop more trust and feel less threatened by questioning organizational norms and patterns of operation. The team model can also foster improved leadership for the schools by not only developing a cadre to identify and work on problems, but also by providing a forum for the acting out of healthy leadership practices and feedback on potentially destructive characteristics. Finally, this model could move the schools to the next logical step of team building for the schools; that is, the incorporation of representative parents, students, and other members of the community in an on-going evaluation and renewal process for the schools. It is with this potential in mind that this study of the teams in their first year of operation was undertaken. If the program can successfully integrate social research findings with reality-based

problem-solving, then the teams can develop the potential which they have revealed in their first year of development. It is hoped that the findings of this study can contribute to their development.

Organizations: The Changing of the Bureaucratic Model

As Max Weber, Frederick Taylor and other researchers on organizations defined the bureaucratic model as the most efficient system of organizing work for the productivity of the industrial era, pioneering research in the 1930's by Fritz Roethlisberger and W. J. Dickson in Management and the Worker developed a theory recognizing the importance of workers' feelings, attitudes, beliefs, perceptions and ideas on levels of productivity.[30] Research on this phenomenon of worker behavior, particularly in groups and their effects on organizations, was slow until Kurt Lewin emerged in the 1930's with his theories and experiments on group dynamics and with the establishment of the National Training Laboratory in 1947 in Bethel, Maine.[31] Application of these theories to industries began toward the end of the 1950's in key firms in the science-based industries in the United States. These first interventions focused on climate of the workplace rather than on the structure. The bureaucratic structure of the work force

was untouched, though an opening was made for a collaborating direction as industrial leaders coped with the pressures of a quickly changing, turbulent environment.[32]

In Britain, after World War II, job breakdown was carried to an extreme, leading to even greater worker alienation.[33] Experiments in job enlargement, rotation, and enrichment were tried. This was a significant development because it brought out the importance of job satisfaction as a critical factor in the humanization of the technological bureaucracy. For example, in Britain, a new direction of development toward the new collaborative model began through the discovery of the autonomous work group called the "sociotechnical system." This theory is concerned with trying to match the social and technical systems of an organization.[34]

Another breakthrough was made through research at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology by two Sloan fellows under the direction of Douglas MacGregor. Findings indicated that a "unity of purpose" which characterized the working relationship between line and staff managers of a division of a large organization resulted in a more economically successful division for the company. The division was also regarded as best managed in the company because line and staff workers ignored the bureaucratic

barriers which separated them and demonstrated a high commitment to the objectives they had jointly developed and a high degree of informal collaboration.[35] Lippett also found that cohesive groups helped with anxiety and Cartwright showed that opportunities for upward communication could be a source of improving workers' sense of power when empowering through promotion was not possible.[36]

As management people and social scientists worked together on efforts to study and improve the industrial organizations, there developed a definition of "human relations." Elton Mayo and his associates "discovered" the influence of human-social factors upon production in work settings. This focus on organizations looks on them as social systems and studies the effects of work groups on performance, attitude, and production. Social scientists such as Warren Bennis and Kenneth Benne and others elaborated on the theories of "planned change" in organizations in which organizations as client and the researcher as "change agent" collaborated on improving the climate and the structure of interactions in the organizations to improve productivity and performance. Client "growth" was identified as the goal of the change agent, growth being defined as the "increased ability of the client system to face and solve problems, both those

stemming from disequilibrium in the client's relations with its environment (adaptation) and those stemming from disequilibriums internal to its systems (adjustment)."[38]

Through the research on organizations and the application of theories to the field, the concept of Organizational Development evolved. It is based on a conceptual framework of human behavior in groups and how these groups have an impact on the organization itself. These concepts embody strategies which can improve the overall organization by helping people in groups become self-conscious of their impact on the organization and how they can and do manipulate that impact in both positive and negative ways. With this awareness, groups can develop a sense of power in making their organizations responsive to their needs as well as addressing the needs of the organization as a whole. Organizational development is based on the assumption that many of the problems confronting changing organizations arise from the nature of the group or organization in which the change is occurring.[39] There are certain skills which are necessary for members of an organization to acquire in order to change their organizations so that they become self-correcting, self-renewing systems of people who are receptive to evidence that change is required and are able to respond with innovative integrated programs. These

skills involve: (1) clarifying communication and building interpersonal trust which can reinforce a climate of openness; (2) establishing goals and exploring the differentiation and integration of effort needed to achieve them so that ownership is developed: (3) uncovering and working with conflict so that norms for collaboration can replace norms for avoiding conflict; (4) improving group procedures at meetings; (5) solving problems by harnessing human resources to extract creative solutions; (6) making decisions and moving decisions to action; and (7) developing criteria to assess change.[40] The application of these skills to work-groups requires some major changes for organizations, particularly those still structured by the bureaucratic model. The major adaptation requires a democratization of the workplace. The literature on organizations show many successful applications of Organizational Development strategies such as participatory decision-making (the Scanlon Plan) and group problem-solving, although some studies indicate that training in these techniques off-site do not result in transfer to the organization as the Harrison research of the Agyris theories has shown.[41] Full democratization of the workplace has not been implemented in the United States to any great extent,[42] although an experiment in ownership and management of the Northwestern plywood mills

studied by Paul Bernstein does contribute to the understanding of this phenomenon. Although the nearly two dozen worker-owned plywood mills in the Pacific Northwest have been in successful operation for nearly twenty years, they have been studied by only two researchers previously, Berman in 1967 and Bellas in 1972, according to Bernstein. The democratization process in these companies emphasizes the politics within the organization and a sharing of power, although the mills have gradations in participation and their political maturity. Using the Scanlon system of a feedback loop between participation in decision-making and economic reward for increases in productivity or profits produced by the participants, this participatory economic feedback brings about a convergence of the goals of management and the goals of the workers. Both sides operate more consciously toward the same organizational goals of higher output at lower cost and toward similar personal goals of a satisfying and self-esteemed worklife.[43] Bernstein points out, however, that the shift from bureaucracy to full democratization of the workplace might require some basic changes in our general system of education, because there is growing evidence that education deeply affects how people approach their jobs and careers, how they approach authority figures at work.[44] As Professor Bernstein pointed out in a recent article,

"the purpose of cooperatives (or worker-owned companies) is not just economic productivity but the humanistic and political task of positive growth for the workers, real service to the community, and the political change catalyzed by these models."[45] There are other examples of large democratized organizations in the United States such as the Consumer United Group, a $60 million insurance company in Washington, D.C. that became managed by its workers seventy-eight years ago. Oakland (California) Scavenger Company is a refuse company that has been worker owned since the 1930's and the American Cast Iron Pipe Company of Birmingham, Alabama is another long time worker-owned business. As Professor George Benello of Hampshire College states, "Cooperative businesses work well because of democratic control . . . real social change depends on changes in personal attitudes and behavior, and this comes with learning how to be cooperative in groups."[46] Thus, education or a re-education is necessary for the successful democratization of the workplace because the relational system is the basic unit of collaborative effort and two important skills must be learned: (1) participatory decision-making and (2) use of human support systems.[47] An examination of the present structure of the public educational system of the schools in America demonstrates the difficulties which the schools

have in exemplifying and teaching democratic principles in their bureaucratic orientation.

The Public School as Bureaucracy

In his study, The One Best System: A History of Urban Education, David Tyack (1974) traces the development of the public school from a community-controlled village school to the bureaucratic model of today's centralized organizations. Two powerful forces were responsible for the development. On the one hand, leading educators themselves, like William T. Harris, were impressed with the order and efficiency of the new technology and forms of organization they saw - the division of labor in the factory, the punctuality of the railroad, the chain of command and coordination in modern business and they argued that bureaucratized schooling was becoming an urban and economic necessity.[48] On the other hand were the societal forces whose spokepersons were becoming more and more critical of the achievements of the schools. School boards were dominated by businessmen. Prior to 1900, most city school boards had been large, representing a wide variety of constituencies. Gradually they were reduced and their membership was dominated by area businessmen. In 1903, the Atlantic Monthly published an attack on politics

in schools and recommended the adoption of a business organizational pattern. In 1905, the National Education Association held a symposium on the question, "What are at present the Most Promising Subjects for Such Investigations as the National Council of Education Should Undertake?" and the first topic was, "A Comparison of Modern Business Methods with Educational Methods."[49] There was also an "efficiency" impact on the curriculum, as schools were pressured to produce a more practical, vocational education. Students began to be viewed as products. A 1909 study by Leonard Ayres, Laggards in Our Schools, even had "retarded" children studied by an efficiency expert.[50] With the emergence of Frederic W. Taylor, schools were subjected to analysis of their management techniques by "the scientific management or Taylor system." As early as 1911, educators began responding publicly to the demands to apply scientific management to the work of the school. In 1916, Ellwood P. Cubberly, Dean of the School of Education at Stanford, in his textbook, Public School Administration, provided a direct link between educational efficiency experts and the scientific management movement:

> Our schools are, in a sense, factories in which the raw products (children) are to be shaped and fashioned into products to meet the various demands of life. The specifications for manufacturing come from

> the demands of twentieth century civilization, and it is the business of the school to build its pupils according to the specifications laid down.[51]

All members of the school community were scrutinized by the efficiency experts, especially the teachers. But efficiency ratings were also devised for children.[52]

Michael Katz developed the thesis that schools were not the great democratic systems for identifying talent and matching it with opportunity, but structures to perpetuate the bureaucracy. The hierarchical configuration of the bureaucratic structure is reflected by class structures in the larger society. Education reinforced those class structures. According to Katz, the basic structure of American education has not altered since 1880 when it was fixed. As urban centers developed in New England, schools came to be perceived as the key agencies for uplifting the quality of city life and helping to improve the manufacturing population. Thus, regular attendance in school became important training for the factory. The formation of right attitudes became particularly important for the immigrant children. For Katz, values which have permeated public education since the nineteenth century such as order, efficiency, and uniformity, have strong class overtones.

From these historical perspectives, many parallels to current movements for educational reform are implied. Once

again, concern over social disorder in the city streets, intertwined this time with the thrust for civil rights, provided powerful stimulation for educational reform in the 1960's. Yet the movement has been fragmented by these strains and contradictions between integration and compensatory education, between integration and decentralization, between professional reform and community participation. For Katz, the prognosis is bleak, yet he does offer suggestions for school reformers based on his historical analysis. One is the realization that many goals set for schools have not been fulfilled because they are impossible to fulfill. This dilemma for schools was underscored by Dr. Mario Fantini, Dean of the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts at a recent symposium sponsored by a citizen's group in Boston known as the City-Wide Educational Coalition. In the keynote address, Dean Fantini stated that, although educators all agree on the broad objectives of education, we are divided on the means of achieving them. More and more responsibilities for the education of youth have been added to the schools so that they are "wobbling under the weight of increased responsibilities." Schools, he pointed out, should deliver schooling; education is the responsibility of all of the educators of the young; the parents and family, the school, the community including its business resources.[54]

Katz made a second recommendation for the schools which has to do with the atmosphere of the school and its norms. The reformulation of educational purposes cannot be accomplished within the current educational structures because bureaucracy as a form of organization has led to a crystallization of particular values.[55] Through their structures, schools communicate a purpose, a set of norms. A reformulation of educational objectives requires a questioning and restructuring of educational norms.

The crystallization of particular values in the adoption of the bureaucratic model for schools is poignantly illustrated in the history of the Boston Public School System, particularly its recent history. In his study of the Boston schools, Peter Schrag examined the relationship between the political and social structures of the community and the educational program of the school system to determine how one shapes the other. He found Boston to be institution-minded in the sense of the military or civil service in terms of structure and in their function of defining limits, successes, and position. This institutional mentality, coupled with Boston's failure to develop economically as the Northeast's most important port, and its blueblood First Family conservatism have all reinforced each other. He found the school system to be composed of two administrative

networks: one formal, official and impersonal, the civil service system; the other familiar, often friendly and in its own way far more official. The informal network within the system makes it apparent that the administration has not only captured the civil service system, but has learned how to use it.[56] Reviewing the educational reform proposals of Superintendent Ohrenberger's administration, Schrag could find almost no effect on educational substance because, for the most part, "innovations tend to remain well encapsulated, like droplets of oil on still water."[57] Forces for change remain outside the system. The School Committee, the administration, the majority of the teachers, and the electorate reinforce each other. Programs and attitudes follow what the administration senses to be the wishes of the community, especially the politically vocal. Schrag felt that even a change in the electoral attitude would not have much impact on traditions and relationships inherited from decades of practice. Yet he did discover individual attempts at change. In 1965, teachers at the Boardman School subsystem demonstrated that freedom from restrictions - sometimes simply the time to reflect and discuss - can produce a level of morale that could not possibly be achieved by a rule-minded administration. When these teachers were given a little time to spend with one another, are treated as

professionals, and are given the freedom to function, they responded even in this civil service environment.[58]

Schools and the Process of Change

As outlined in the previous section, school reform movements at the turn of the century focused on the organization of the school. The bureaucratic model was seen as the "one best system." This direction culminated in the 1960's with the development of "teacher-proof" curriculum material, as if the professional role of teacher could be filled by any person with a modicum of teacher training. As Charles Silberman (1970) noted in his study, Crisis in the Classroom, the reformers not only ignored the classroom teacher but tried to bypass the teacher altogether, viewing the teacher as a technician.[59] Teachers remained outside the process of change in the schools. In reviewing the literature on the process of change in schools, it was not until the mid-seventies that researchers began to link the failure of educational innovations with the exclusion of the implementers, the teachers, in the planning of change. The new math curriculum is an obvious example of the results of this type of approach to educational change.[60]

The review of the literature on staff development and school change was well documented in a recent study by Philip Stec in Staff Development: Approaches in Theory and Practice, presented in a dissertation study for the Graduate School of Education of the University of Massachusetts, 1978. He divided the literature into two categories: the collection catalogued in ERIC which describes individual programs or components of various training strategies, usually written by people connected with the projects under review; and those studies of large numbers of individual programs done by Lawrence and Edelfelt for Florida State University, and by the staff of the Rand Corporation, who prepared a study of inservice programs for the United States' Office of Education of the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. In addition, he reviewed studies on change and influence, organizational behavior and social psychology, which he found appropriate to the review of staff development programs.[61] A condensation of his review of the literature on staff development is therefore helpful for the context of this study:

> The Lawrence study of 97 successful inservice programs indicate that management of inservice is important, that programs which have individualized activities are more likely to accomplish their objectives than are programs that have common activities for

> all participants, and programs which emphasize opportunities for demonstrations and feedback are more effective; that programs run by local resource people rather than outside consultants and school-based programs had more of an effect on complex behavior such as attitude change. Also, programs where teachers participate as planners and helpers have more success in accomplishing goals.

Stec cautions on an application of these findings to the development of new programs or approaches to staff development because the study reflects the biases generally accepted of inservice education and reinforced by special interest groups such as teacher unions. Also, he found no reflection of the knowledge regarding change and influence and organizational theory, concluding that the findings could not be replicated in other settings.[62]

In contrast, Stec found the Rand Corporation research findings did attempt to link the literature of change, social psychology, sociology and organizational behavior to the problem of change in schools.[63]

But inservice is only one of several sources of change which can be used in an organization. Citing Harris, Bessent, and McIntyre, Stec notes four additional sources: authority, rules, alteration of functional specialization, and personnel development.[64] This approach to change in bureaucratic operations suggests the argument of Bennis and other Organizational Development strategists that other

changes besides personnel development are possible and necessary in school organizations. Organizational change, according to the Stec review, is particularly necessary at the secondary level:

> Dale Mann, the Rand Corporation studies, the Kettering studies of educational innovations and others have described the resistence of secondary school faculties to any process of change, particularly those changes which would be of a personal nature or affect one's perceived teaching style. Gross, Giacquinta, and Bernstein as well as Cartwright have indicated that individuals, particularly those in highly departmentalized and structured organizations such as a secondary school setting, are often more aggressively resistent to any process of change than are the organizations to which they belong. Rogers, Katz & Kahn, and Gross indicate that the organizational aspects of secondary schools themselves are more pronounced than at the elementary levels, thus making the introduction of any change process more difficult. Neither the Kettering Foundation nor the Rand studies found examples of a successful program of staff development at the secondary level. Kettering Foundation, Katz & Kahn, Bidwell and others writing about change indicate the necessity for members of the school organization to be aware of roles, values, and norms which hold them together in the organizational context.[65]

Stec suggests the following criteria based on his review of the literature for a successful staff development program:

1. an awareness among school personnel of the formal and informal organizational binds and relationships;

2. perception of a need for change among school faculty, both as individuals and as an organization;

3. faculty and administration of any school undergoing staff development should be relatively stable and a "critical mass" should be involved in the process;

4. the administration must be perceived as supportive of the proposed change process;

5. staff development programs should have personal as well as organizational payoffs.[66]

Another recent dissertation study by Margaret Fraher LeGendre, Mechanisms for Secondary School Change: A Case Study of the English High Teachers' Center (1979) for the Graduate School of Education of the University of Massachusetts reveals some pertinent data on the relationship between staff development and the organizational setting of the secondary school. In her review of the literature, LeGendre found that the manner in which change has been attempted in schools is responsible for the meager results, citing studies by Berman & McLaughlin, 1975; Edelfelt, 1972; Fullan, 1972; Goodlad, 1975. Some of the specific causes are: that many change models in schools have been strongly influenced by the "diffusion model" in which emphasis is placed on events leading up to and including the adoption decision. Installation is assumed to follow a rationally ordered sequence once the particular innovation has been chosen

(Everhart, in LeGendre, 1977). But, as LeGendre comments, educational goals are less specific than industry from whence this model was adapted. It is the implementation process, as studied in the Rand research, which is the critical phase for a change process and this implementation process, as LeGendre points out, has no substantive analytical literature.[68] There are, however, particular strategies identified in the literature for dealing with the "incremental" nature of implementation of a change strategy. These are: participation of those responsible for carrying out the change in the decision making process; provision of responsive feedback mechanisms, such as frequent meetings among project staff; provision of resources and support for local materials development; and involvement of a critical mass in the project implementation (Berman & McLaughlin, 1975; Fullan, 1972; Fullan & Pomfret, 1977; Goodlad, 1975; Gross, Giacquinta & Bernstein, 1971; Regan & Leithwood, 1974).[69]

As LeGendre points out, the literature reflects the position that traditional modes of inservice training are ill-suited for the purpose of supporting practitioners in the utilization and implementation of educational change (Case, 1977; Devaney, 1977; Edelfelt, 1972; Edelfelt & Johnson, 1975; Eraut, 1972; Fantini, 1973; Hite & Howey, 1977; Howey, 1974). Citing Lawrence (1974) and Yarger

(1977), LeGendre concludes that inservice programs must be developed which emphasize not solution-giving, but problem-solving, which offer not sporadic activities designed to remediate teachers' deficits, but opportunities for continuous, developmental teacher education, focusing not only on the innovation, but the innovating school.[70]

Her study thus proposes the model of the teacher center as a means of integrating staff development with school renewal efforts. But implications for future research on teachers centers as school improvement strategies have several problems: what is the carryover to the classroom; how can the teacher center accommodate school renewal over time; and what of the involvement of the principal in a design which closes him/her out in favor of the concept of "teacher ownership?"[71]

Leadership and the Role of the Principal

If recent research findings on the pivotal role of the principal in school improvement strategies are acknowledged by program planners, then staff development designs such as the Teacher Center model contain a serious flaw in that they exclude the principal from active participation. While many of the sociological studies concur with Willard Waller's findings in 1932 which showed that the most

significant people for teachers are other teachers,[72] the role of the principal in the change process implies that the interaction between teachers and principals will have a bearing on that role (Mann, 1976; Sarason, 1971; Barth, 1981).[73] In a study of ninety-four Long Island elementary principals, principals' individual styles of social interaction and their perceived effectiveness as leaders were shown to be strongly related. The theoretical base for this study came from the literature on administrative role behavior, particularly the work of Carl Edwards who has shown that most people conform to one of three styles - "instrumental," "cooperational," or "analytic" - in their responses to other people or to the environment. The "instrumental" individual tends to focus all energies on a single objective; the "cooperational" person often places needs of others above all else; and the "analytic" style is characterized by flexibility, accuracy of perception, and ability to see alternatives. Results indicated a significantly higher level of analytic style for principals seen as effective than for those seen as ineffective.[74] This "analytic" style of interaction implies a flexibility in decision-making as well as an ability to collect and use accurate data from the environment. But other studies show that these abilities are not characteristic of many school administrators. For

example, in a study of principals and their decision-making patterns, Cross found that elementary school principals' decision-making was essentially reactive and rested heavily on information offered by subordinates. In only eight of the eighty-six problems did the subjects use data outside the coterie, suggesting considerable social isolation of the principal.[75] Another important implication of the study was the pace of the decision-making observed. Decisions came shortly after the problem stimuli and the number of problems per day averaged one hundred. Thus it may be impractical to suggest that principals should reach decisions through the more classic, self-conscious and deliberate steps in decision-making. The study also questioned the reality of what constitutes a principal's day and the limits imposed on him/her when occupied in this manner. It is no wonder then that the public perception of the principal as "mindless bureaucratic robots" as characterized by a recent editorial in the Wall Street Journal[76] is accepted as a closer description of the role than have findings such as the Rand Corporation research. And a survey of 203 elementary and secondary administrators in Georgia's public schools revealed that the interaction between teachers and principals has not changed much since Waller described their relationship as one of loyalty and even sychophancy on the surface but a latent rebellion

below this.[77] In the Georgia survey, most principals said that they believed in group decision-making, but said they lacked a confidence in their teachers. Most of the principals (82%) saw teachers as power seekers, and 55% perceived them as more interested in their own welfare than in that of their students. Principals also showed a strong need to supervise teachers closely (65%) and also felt they must restrict the freedom of teachers (78%). The researcher concluded that there is little chance for teacher/administrator teamwork in schools, citing that more than half (56%) did not see teachers accepting the responsibility and headaches involved in making decisions about critical school problems. Even in curriculum areas, a large percentage of principals (78%) reported a need to monitor curriculum materials closely, apparently questioning teacher competence in that area.[78]

In contrast, a research study undertaken recently in one district in the Boston Public Schools on the role of the principal and curriculum implementation showed that the principals participating in the study did not perceive of themselves as instructional leaders: "Lack of or limited communication or interaction among principals and their teaching staffs regarding curriculum policies, instruction, and change . . . not only resulted in confusion but in diminished motivation, resentment, and alienation on the part of the teachers."[79]

One factor which may contribute to the conflicting definitions of the role of the principal was studied by Gross and Trask (1976). Differences in the emphasis on instructional leadership and also patterns of interactions with the staff were found to be related to the sex of the principal. Data collected from a national cross-section of 189 elementary school principals in 41 large school systems in the United States revealed that most men, but only a minority of women, claimed that they had no strong motivation to become school teachers. The men also gave serious consideration to becoming principals much earlier in their careers than women. The study also revealed that the sex factor had a bearing on the principals' performance and the operation of their schools, finding that women exerted greater control over their teachers' professional activities than men and that women associated more frequently with members of the faculty ouside of school than the men.[80] This study concluded that these sex difference findings imply that many men in the principalship lack the knowledge and skills required to offer professional direction to the instructional programs in their schools. They are being asked to serve as instructional leaders, but lack the capabilities.[81] As Michael Timpane remarked in a recent article, although the findings on the pivotal role of the principal are strong

and prominent, they were not accompanied by knowledge of how to change principals to make them more effective.[82]

What makes an effective administrator? Donald L. Walters analyzed four systems for assessing or measuring administrative competencies and compared them on their strengths and weaknesses. They are: Educational Leadership Appraisal whose leadership dimensions include management and organization, communication, problem-solving, task orientation, initiative, stress tolerance, group leadership, adaptability, and interpersonal qualities; the Georgia Principal Assessment System in which principals record their perception of how often and how well they perform 100 job-related tasks and assessments are also made by teachers, an external observer, and the superintendent; the Individual Learning Materials is a learning format designed for individualized, competency-based education for graduate level use; and the Special Education Supervisor Training project was the generation of a model for the competency-guided preparation of educational leaders of all kinds. As Walters summarizes, of the four systems studied, only the Georgia Principal Assessment System includes appraisals by persons other than the individuals involved in self-appraisal. Thus the primary use of the assessments has been for personal development, rather than inservice training or re-training of administrators.[83]

Another approach to the question of what constitutes effective administration and how do we measure it was the hybrid approach combining both theory and practice recently written in a book by Donald E. Walker entitled: The Effective Administrator (1979). Ineffective administrators are described as status conscious and "preoccupied with authority and privilege." They perceive their institutions as inert, perverse, the faculty as impractical amateurs or troublemakers, their staff as naive and mischievous. They perceive themselves as guardians or enforcers of high standards not shared by the majority. They tend to stifle criticism. Effective administrators, while exercising the rights and perogatives of office, recognize separability of self and office. In serving the academic enterprise they are not personally threatened by "intemporate attacks." They see their role as working with differing constituencies and attempt to reconcile the differences among them to arrive at solutions to problems. Their style is pragmatic. They tend to be more concerned about their responsibility in presiding over the decision-making process than about making every decision personally.[84]

These descriptors of effective and ineffective administrative styles are similar to the findings of the National Principalship Study undertaken by Gross and Herriot in 1959 and published in 1965. Their study was

designed to explore the organizational effects and determinants of variation in the performance of administrators in schools. To ascertain the effects of the professional leadership of principals on their organizations, they examined the relationship between their Executive Professional Leadership or EPL which refers to the attempts of an executive to influence the behavior of subordinates with a claim to professional status (teachers) and three characteristics of schools widely accepted as meaningful criteria for assessing their effectiveness: staff morale, the professional performance of teachers, and the pupils' learning. They found positive relationships between the EPL and each of these three dimensions. These findings bear upon the controversy over the role of school principals as instructional leaders as opposed to the provider of routine administrative services.[85] Of particular significance to this study was the finding that one condition which stood in the way of a principal's serving as the leader of his professional staff was his unwillingness to allow teachers to participate in decisions about central school issues. Another was the stress on distinctions of status; that is, his bureaucratic relationship to teachers, which may be coupled with his unwillingness or inability to offer them social support.[86] Four personal characteristics were suggested

as having some predictive value in the selection of principals: a high level of academic achievement in college, a high degree of interpersonal skills, the motive of service, and the commitment of off-duty time to one's job.[87]

The notion of "leadership" as a characteristic of school administrators is a rather recent concept[88] and in education as well as other fields, researchers have conducted many studies to ascertain if it is the person and some unique charismatic quality or the situation. Two extensive surveys of leadership studies reported in a recent article have led some authorities to conclude that "the assumption that leaders are born, not made," is largely false. The only inherited trait is intelligence and that relationship is low.[89] These surveys indicate that characteristics of charismatic leadership can be learned to a functional degree by administrators if they cultivate cooperation and support by relating to people on a personal basis in and out of school, in face-to-face communication and through the identification and appreciation of diverse needs and interests and aspirations. In other words, charismatic leadership is an outgrowth of sound human relationship and the result of intelligent perceptions of what affects the educational organization.[90]

MacGregor and other social researchers pointed to the situational aspect of leadership[91] while Sarason argued that this situational aspect is further defined by the perception of the educational "system" on the part of all who work within it and this governs the role performance of many principals.[92] Thus it may not be constructive to view educational leadership by the classic distinctions first experimented with in the White and Lippitt (1960) experiment of autocratic, democratic and laissez-faire styles of adult leaders and their effects on groups of boys[93] though these distinctions will be discussed in Chapter V in regard to the findings of this study. Indeed, in the Rutter, et al study of urban London schools, no distinction in the different leadership styles for the schools was found to have had an impact on the effectiveness of the schools for student outcomes. Rather, it was linked with features of the schools as social organizations, or its "ethos."[94] Schools characterized by punctuality of lessons, where teachers gave immediate feedback and frequent praise, and where students were made to feel that success was expected of them had more positive outcomes. Though leadership styles differed among the schools, there was no correlation between the effective school and a particular style though the study found that it was easier to be a good teacher in some schools than

others. For example, schools in which disciplinary policy and the curriculum were discussed and worked on by teachers rather than being imposed from above had better student achievement.

In the Rutter study, the research team looked at three variables of staff organization: the planning of courses, supervision of teachers' work, and the patterns of decision-making. In terms of planning courses, the schools in which teachers planned jointly had better student attendance and less delinquency. In schools where teachers' work such as homework assignments were checked by superiors, there were more positive student outcomes. And in the patterns of decision-making, schools with good outcomes said that decisions were made at a senior level rather than in the staff room of the principal (most schools had an inner cabinet of senior teachers).[95] Thus it may not be that one particular leadership style is important to the success of the school but the more subtle process of how that style is carried out and how it is perceived by teachers that makes more of a difference; for example, the checking of a teacher's work may be interpreted as a caring and respect for his or her enterprise whereas a laissez-faire approach may be viewed as not valuing the work. Leaders who can instill a common sense of purpose and a constant commitment can affect positive change, even in large city school systems.[96]

In a recent article, Rogus and Martin (1979) argue that staff development requires a careful consideration of selected findings on the culture of the school, regardless of external pressures. Findings related to the nature of teaching, relationships of teachers with each other and the administrative staff, and the relationship of teaching and research must be included in analyzing the needs of the staff for professional development. They rationalize that: (1) teaching by its nature is enormously draining in a physical, emotional, and psychic sense, and for many teachers becomes routine; (2) the limited technology of teaching leads to self-doubt among many teachers on issues of competence; (3) teaching is a lonesome profession and the history of the school organization contributes to this - most who are in the organization to help are at the top of the hierarchy. The authors propose that principals can help by: (1) acknowledging the draining nature in interacting with staff; (2) reinforce individual teachers; (3) encourage staff members to reinforce one another; (4) encourage staff development planning groups to hold inservices on time management; (5) encourage the staff to set weekly objectives for each class so teachers can see they are more effective than they believe. They should also encourage staff to team on an informal basis.[97]

Although the research attempts to distinguish between more or less effective leadership styles have yielded very inconclusive evidence, the literature on school improvement indicates that teachers, like members of any other organization, need to participate in decisions which affect the quality of their worklife. They need to know that their work is valued and they need to interact with colleagues, both administrators and other teachers, in both formal and informal structures in the course of their work. Collaboration models such as school management teams, public schools and Schools of Education, and public schools and state departments of education are increasingly being experimented with and evaluated. The literature is scant but potentially hopeful for the schools.

School Improvement Studies

As noted in the summary of the LeGendre study, the dominant form of educational reform in the 1960's was research, development and diffusion. As Goodlad (1976) pointed out, we are still stuck with this model of change in the schools. What this model does not take into account sufficiently is the actual users of a particular innovation. Although research has shown that the optimal unit of educational change is the single school, the

interactions of these people, the language they use, the traditions they uphold, the beliefs to which they subscribe, all the attributes which make up the culture of the school were virtually ignored by earlier reform movements.[98] In addition to this insufficient attention to the culture of the school, most activities of teacher inservice programs did not have any connection to the real problems facing their schools. In his study of 67 elementary schools in the United States, Goodlad found only four schools in which there was anything resembling a critical mass of personnel working on a systematic approach to solving school problems.[99] In a recent review of three major studies[100] (1) the Concerns Based Adoption Model (CBAM), the Rand study on federal improvement projects, and the I/D/E/A study of school improvements directed by John Goodlad all indicate that the process of improvement happens simultaneously on two levels; the individual teacher level and the organizational level. These studies also indicate the importance of certain components in a staff development model, as well as underscoring the importance of including staff development in the total project design. The Rand study, for example, concluded that principal participation in program training was important not only for them to help teachers implement program objectives, but also to show support for teachers.

Another important component was the teachers' participation in project decisions which had an effect on teacher attitudes and their commitment to the program.[101] This participation is not just a question of governance such as the control issue implicit in the design of teacher centers, but an opportunity for growth and learning which can help teachers align their personal and professional goals with those of the school organization.[102] Recent research in New York and Illinois[103] using Maslow's scale of needs also showed that, while teachers were generally well satisfied with the two lower order needs, they were appreciably less fulfilled with the three higher order needs. Researchers concluded that it is at the esteem and self-actualization levels where teachers need fulfillment, suggesting that schools as organizations need to find ways to increase opportunities for esteem or, as Roland Barth terms it, "mutual visibility."[104]

The failure of a $450,000.00 program designed by the Clinic of New York University and Junior High School #57 in the Bedford Stuyvesant section of Brooklyn was linked to the fact that teachers were not involved in the earliest decision making process which established the organizational structure of the project. This resulted in confusion about the nature and responsibility levels of decision. Power conflicts and political implications

caused by the ambiguity over governance led to a lack of ownership in the problem solving process. As a result, teachers did not see that they were going to be rewarded by innovative practices because norms had not been changed or considered. The authors conclude that the leadership of the project failed in diagnosing the organizational environment prior to project planning. They advocate collaboration models of educational partnerships coupled with strong decentralized governance plans, noting that collaboration as a "voluntary relationship between two or more organizations working toward objectives, and sharing the planning, decision-making, implementation, and evaluation."[105] They suggest that colleges of education can collaborate with schools by offering graduate courses located in school buildings and centered around the problems of the teachers in those buildings. Graduate credit can be earned for work which involves both research and practical application of theory.

Research on the content of inservice programs and the effect on teacher change indicates that affective and cognitive approaches cannot be relied upon to bring about increased effectiveness. Such sessions can often lead participants to cling more tenaciously to old behavior.[106] Programs that pay attention to the schools as organizations as well as the people who work in them have been achieving

more success.[107] In the Goodlad study of intervention strategies in several California schools, group work for the school staff was necessary to produce what researchers call a self-renewing school, rather than work to improve the individual competencies of teachers. Consultants from U.C.L.A. developed peer groups in the schools in which they worked. In this study, both formal and informal staff arrangements which facilitated interaction and greater agreement among staff members (principals and teachers) about what was going on in the school - good or bad - showed higher levels of dialogue, decision-making, action, and evaluation, as measured by the researchers. Thus the program worked on school improvement through improving on organizational norms of the school; for example, the formal and informal interactions of staff members. Also, communication was increased because it was permissible to discuss school problems without fear of reprisals.[108]

A similar strategy was attempted in San Jose, California, in a teacher-administrator team project which was funded by the National Institute of Education. Teachers were trained to participate with their principals in identifying and resolving local school problems and to sustain that involvement by implementing formal decision-making procedures at each school site. In its third year evaluation of the project, the Stanford Research

Institute found that the Teacher Involvement Project or TIP was well regarded by staff members and was producing local improvements. Three reasons were proposed for its success: (1) the project was locally controlled; (2) the teacher participation in decision-making was instituted at the building level through the formal mechanism of a faculty constitution and faculty councils; and, (3) the project received the full support of building and district administrators. In the implementation phase of the project, workshops were conducted to teach teachers how to determine specific decision-making interests of their faculties, how to establish priorities among those areas chosen, how to determine the degree of faculty involvement considered appropriate in each high priority area, and how to formalize self-governance by forming a council and a school constitution. Workshops in the second year focused on the progress made by the individual schools, their special problems, and the details of writing formal constitutions for each school. Decision-making areas of particular concern to teachers were distinctly instructional rather than administrative at first, but as the project progressed, the teachers grew increasingly interested in budgetary decisions as they discovered the relationship between the budget and what was possible for them to do in the classroom. As for the level of

involvement, much depended on the issue, the degree to which it affected the significant professional interests of the faculty, and the willingness of the teachers to take risks in assuming responsibilities for these decisions. The project design was not without flaws, however. Although the district superintendent supported the project's goals, support from all principals was not without conflict. At one point in the project, a group of principals objected to the project as inhibiting and undermining their authority as business managers. The superintendent convened a meeting of representative teachers and principals. After the pros and cons of the project had been debated, most of the principals came out in favor of the project. In the judgment of the Stanford evaluators, this result was at least partly because teachers and principals realized they were now interacting in ways that were quite new to them, candidly sharing views on basic and previously unvoiced concerns and discovering common and compatible interests.[109]

Although the I/D/E/A studies of Goodlad and Bentzen describe a reinforcement of interactions between principals and teachers, the San Jose project clearly formalized the process with a constitution. While this may insure that people's rights are not abused, it may hamper the development of a team concept among staff members. The

fact that the project was not designed with input from the principals could have contributed to their lack of support for it. Participatory decision-making must be practiced at all levels of the organization if this power sharing norm is to succeed. Recent legislation in California, Senator Rodda's bill, is attempting to mandate such an approach to school management. The bill requires that superintendents of schools form "management teams of both certified and classified employees" meaning the professional and support staffs and also states that superintendents are charged with making these management teams work. However, the degree to which the team is involved in the decision-making process is left up to the superintendents' perogative.[110] And Goodlad, in his most recent analysis, What Schools Are For? (1980), spoke of the need for both citizens and educators to work together to reconstruct the schools from the monolithic model which has come to mimic big business to make "problem-solving, sensitive human relations, self-understanding, and the integration of one's total life experience the basic common education of the common schools."[111]

An example of the positive effects of a staff development project in which teachers and administrators participate together was reported by Bailey and Morrill (1980). In the 1978-1979 school year, 12 teachers and 3

administrators from 2 elementary schools, one kindergarten, and one middle school in the Appoquininink School District in Delaware implemented a program called "Basic Skills Instructional Improvement." In collaboration with Research for Better Schools, Incorporated, Philadelphia, the teachers and administrators designed a project to improve classroom instruction based on research findings on the variable of pupil engaged time which was found to correlate positively with performance on achievement tests. With the help of their supervisors, teachers compared data from their own classrooms on pupil engaged time and worked on methods to improve the amount of pupil engaged time in their classrooms. The administrators encouraged teachers to make use of the research findings and participated in workshops which emphasized materials by Hunter (1967) on practical approaches to learning theory. They worked on strategies together. The program resulted in the development of an on-going model of staff development in the schools in which training based on research, discussion meetings, and classroom observations became the backbone for continuous staff development. A by-product of the project was that teachers began asking other teachers to observe their classes. Also, teachers began training other teachers using videotapes to help them improve the amount of pupil engaged time in classes.[112]

Organizational Development Applied to Schools

Collaboration and Teams. Many have theorized that an effective organization is one in which members work to achieve the goals of the organization (Sarason, 1971; Hall, 1972; Neale, Bailey and Ross, 1981)[113] and that they work more effectively when there is agreement on goals (Argyris, 1962).[114] The typical American high school is a complex organization which has increased in size by 50% up until 1977. Adding to that complexity and rapid expansion has been the style of reform movements in the 1970's which came largely from the courts. Desegregation orders, Special Needs legislation, and the sex discrimination guidelines of Title IX and other state mandates have forced principals to contend with advocacy groups and lawsuits. The literature which is attempting to assess school needs in the coming decade is advocating the use of management teams by principals and collaboration models for schools of education, particularly at the graduate level. (Pellicer & Nemeth, 1980; Bailey & Neal, 1980; Moeller & Mahan, 1971).[115] These studies argue that the concept of team management, already used in the private sector, can be applied successfully to schools. They warn that the nature of relationships between team members is a major factor in the team's success or failure and that the principal's

personality structure must be such that they can enjoy the role of being a team participant in the creation of group goals while allowing each member to exercise maximum motivation, ingenuity, and initiative.[116] For principals interested in forming a management team, they suggest the following procedures:

- determine who will be included;
- determine long and short range goals for the organization;
- identify task areas as a basis for designing job descriptions and setting individual goals;
- holding formal meetings at a regular basis;
- making a periodic assessment of progress.

In listing the advantages,[117] Pellicer and Nemeth cite the opportunity for personnel to expand their horizons and enhance their professional development. Higher quality decisions and a higher level of commitment can be achieved. Channels of communication can be opened and the entire operation of the school is not totally dependent on the accessibility of the principal.

Bailey and Neale (1980) report that, based on an analysis of the literature on planned educational change, that teachers must begin to accept more responsibility for making needed improvements in the schools. Due to what the authors refer to as the "age of slowdown," they call for

making use of existing resources by designing collaborative programs. They argue that Organizational Development strategies hold significant promise for improving schools because of the following: (1) the focus on the local school as an organization; (2) the clear articulation of the need for change; (3) commitment at the district level; (4) sustained involvement and commitment of the staff; (5) cooperation among all members of the local school community; (6) strong links to outside resources; (7) illusion of progress being tied to growth must change.[118] DuVall and Erickson (1981) list several definitions recently formulated for school teams: one says that you must have three components - the principle of supporting relationships, group problem-solving and decision-making methods, and high performance goals as a basis of operation. Another states that a management team is a task oriented group which is representative of the important sub systems of the organization which holds some organization roles in common and interacts to a formal role structure and has a sort of reciprocal influence over one another. A third definition states that the team is a group whose role is formalized and legitimized and whose purpose is problem-solving and/or decision making.[119] The authors state that the effects of team management in education is almost non-existent and suggest that research

on small group process, school climate, and institutional change might give clues to the effects of team management. But based on some scant research, the authors state the following in regard to team management:

Proposition #1 - Job satisfaction of persons participating on a team will be higher than persons who function individually. Stavrianos' survey of more than 100 studies on group process is cited; "there is hardly a study in the entire literature that fails to demonstrate that satisfaction is enhanced or other generally ackowledged beneficial consequences accrue from a genuine increase in workers' decision-making power."[120]

Proposition #2 - Workers whose supervisors have influence on decisions made at the top will demonstrate higher job satisfaction.

Proposition #3 - Quality of decisions recommended by teams will be better than working alone. Groups can generate more alternative courses than individuals. The phenomenon of synergy exists in a management team decision process; that is, the total is greater than the sum of its parts. This was demonstrated by Piper, whose research showed that decisions made by a team are "not only better than the initial judgment of the decision maker but are frequently more correct than the decisions of any member of the group."[121] From these propositions the authors conclude

that participative decision-making by a formalized and legitimized management team can lead to increased teacher and principal satisfaction, high teacher morale, and more effective organizational functioning.

The authors suggest three possibilities of how teams work: by the consensus mode in which they wrestle with the problem, the centrist mode in which the team simply provides reactions and suggestions to one decision maker, and by the majority rule or democratic mode which provides less satisfaction among participants than the other two, because it is open to the development of political pressures among participants, the development of coalitions, and for doctrinaire attempts at persuasion. The quality of team results will depend, they argue, on clearly specified ground rules, sensitive applications of knowledge of group processes, and a willingness to open decision-making to a wider group of people. They conclude their analysis by drawing several cautions based on the literature:

1. Clarify which decisions and policy areas remain the province of the top.
2. It is possible for autocracy to prevail under the guise of team management.
3. Some managers will have difficulty operating on a team.
4. The team process is more demanding of time.

5. It takes time to develop trust.

6. Many management teams are too large and unwieldy to be effective.

7. You need interlocking management teams on various levels.

8. Individual differences suggest that some people in the organization are more comfortable with less involvement in the problems of leadership.

9. Teams are not the means to easy solutions to previously unsolved management problems.

Although there is very little literature on school-based teams, there are a number of studies of collaborations. The New Jersey Mainstream Inservice Project is a cooperative effort among 50 local education agencies, several colleges and universities, and the state education agency,. This federally funded project's goal is to facilitate the process of educating the handicapped child but the intent is to develop a system for inservice that can accommodate ever emerging interests and problems. It is based on the premise that "thoughtful planning combined with sustained collaborative effort is the foundation on which effective professional development can evolve." Evaluation of the project after one year of implementation resulted in a focus on the university faculty rather than the school designees and concluded that not all faculty can perform well as facilitators for the groups and that rewards for field experience as opposed to research in a vacuum must be forthcoming.[122]

Keys and Bartunek[123] reported the effects of an Organizational Development intervention in seven elementary schools. Four areas were examined: goal agreement, reported use of process skills, relationships between process skills and goal agreement, and diffusion of the effects of the intervention to new teachers. Principal-teacher teams participated in OD workshops and conducted training seminars in their schools. The experimental teachers increased more in goal agreement than did the control teachers. Experimental teachers also reported more participation in discussion, decisions, and the surfacing of conflict than did the control group. Substantial diffusion of change occurred. After one year, new teachers in the experimental schools were equal to or superior to the experimental teachers in goal agreement and use of process skills, possibly the authors speculate, because the newer teachers did not have an inhibiting history and did not have to change habits and norms of the past. The findings also conflicted with other Organizational Development researchers (Schmuck, Runkel & Langmeyer, 1969)[124] who concluded from their studues that whole faculties had to receve the OD training. In this study, teams of representatives were able to share their learning in bridging the gap. The value of developing shared goals and process skills was found to help teachers

develop mutually supportive relationships, alluding to the creation of resource networks stressed by Sarason.[125]

In another experiment with team development intervention, (Woodman & Sherwood, 1980),[126] 22 three and four person work groups from an engineering course were compared with 22 work groups from another course in which the students were not formed into work teams. Although no difference was found in the performance of the work group experiencing team development and the control group, it is significant that individuals in groups receiving team development perceived their groups as being more effective and reported greater participation than members of the control group. The research design contained several flaws, however, and reflects the difficulties inherent in the study of the effects of OD in organizations. When the intervention is done well but is poorly evaluated, there are problems of internal validity - did it truly make a difference? But when evaluated vigorously, this may have the unintended consequence of destroying its effectiveness. As the authors conclude, for OD researchers this has resulted in some weak interventions strongly measured. For example, in this study, the intervention touched only a small portion of the work life of these groups - the course lasted only six weeks. Also, the factor of competition in grading may have weakened team

motivation. Triads are also sometimes less stable than larger groups.[127]

In a special issue on "Collaboration in Work Settings," of the Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, several case studies are presented which contribute to the literature on the phenomenon.[128] The Social Literacy Project, a collaboration project between the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts and the Springfield School System, began in 1971 for a six year period. It demonstrated that it is possible to overcome obstacles to collaborative problem solving, to develop workable solutions to daily conflicts that create a climate of violence in schools, to increase the uniquely human activities of naming, analyzing, and transforming social environments.[129] Acceptance and support for the project by the superintendent and the principal, combined with a strong commitment of the consultants, resulted in the planned intervention becoming a reality in the schools.

A second case study reports on the intervention team of OD consultants who were requested by the New York State Division of Youth Services to help them design and implement a series of interventions which would result in a structural change that would make the system more sensitive to its mission of service to youth. Little resistence to change was reported, possibly due to the top-to-bottom

control of the change process which was initiated and supported by a new director. A major problem developed in maintaining commitment at all levels of the organization.[130]

An analysis of the struggle to actualize collaboration in an educational resource organization known as Network by its executive director, David Crandall, explains four major barriers to developing an organization based on collaborative values. These were: ownership, the reward system, the developmental status of staff, and the developmental status of the organization. His struggle to give up personal ownership and the staff's needs for autonomous behavior in a competitive economic system led to dissonance between the professed rhetoric of collaboration and the reality of competition. In the commentary on the case studies, the editors conclude by naming the necessary ingredients for moving toward collaboration in work settings. Recognizing that there is a possibility of choice is the first step. Intentional choosing of a central conflict or problem needs a certain consciousness. Third party facilitators may be necessary and in any case, one of the parties must by highly committed to the collaborative value system and to the people involved in order to maintain the process in times of stress. In hierarchical systems, commitment "from the top" is

important, as well as the acquisition of new skills for effective participative decision making. Networks and support systems at various levels of the organization should also be fostered to reinforce new skills. Resistence to change needs to be acknowledged and respected and all participants must realize the amount of time required. The "Surrender of Power" in order to arrive at interdependence can be accomplished through a sharing of resources such as time, knowledge, skills, and status.[132] These case studies and some of the earlier studies referred to in this review of the literature represent experiments in progress. When viewed developmentally, they can contribute to a growing body of research on change in organizations and can also help in the analysis of the Boston Secondary Schools Program which will be presented in Chapter V.

Footnotes

[1]David B. Tyack, The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974).

[2]Ibid., p. 82.

[3]Waller, Sociology, p. 9.

[4]Lortie, Schoolteacher, p. 233.

[5]Seymour B. Sarason, The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change (Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1971), p. 78.

[6]Max Weber, On Charisma and Institution Building. Selected Papers, ed. S.N. Eisenstadt (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968), p. 66.

[7]Ibid., p. 74.

[8]Ibid., p. 75.

[9]Ibid., p. 76.

[10]Alvin Toffler, Future Shock (New York: Bantam Books, 1970).

[11]Douglas MacGregor, The Human Side of Enterprise (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960), p. 15.

[12]Bennis, American Bureaucracy, p. 3.

[13]Caplow, Principles of Organizations, p. 74.

[14]Bennis, American Bureaucracy, p. 6.

[15]Ibid., p. 13.

[16]Ibid., p. 165.

[17]Argyis and Schön, Organizational Learning, p. 43.

[18]Trist, Collaboration, p. 271.

[19]Ibid., pp. 270-271.

[20]Kanter, Corporation, p. 246.

[21]Ibid., p. 194.

[22]Abraham Zaleznik and David Moment, The Dynamics of Interpersonal Behavior (New York: John Wiley & Sons Inc., 1964) p. 4.

[23]Ibid., pp. 6-7.

[24]Bennis, Planning, p. 237.

[25]Zaleznik, Interpersonal Behavior, p. 62.

[26]MacGregor, Human Side, p. 33.

[27]Bennis, Changing Organizations, p. 66.

[28]Bennis, Planning of Change, p. 141.

[29]Ibid., pp. 141-145.

[30]Bennis, Changing Organizations, p. 66.

[31]MacGregor, Human Side, p. 228.

[32]Trist, Collaboration, p. 274.

[33]Ibid.

[34]Ibid., p. 275.

[35]MacGregor, Human Side, p. 228.

[36]Bennis, Planning of Change, p. 266.

[37]Ibid., p. 69.

[38]Ibid., p. 230.

[39]Argyis and Schön, Organizational Learning, p. 17.

[40]Schmuck, Organizational Development, pp. 19-20.

[41]Bennis, Changing Organizations, p. 170.

[42]Kanter, Corporation, pp. 274-279.

[43]Bernstein, Paul, Workplace Democratization: Its Internal Dynamics, (New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1980), p. 67.

[44]Cited in Bernstein from an HEW Study in 1973, p. 63.

[45]Corrine McLaughlin, "Doing Business Cooperatively," New Roots, (Holiday 1981) 19 p. 39.

[46]Ibid.

[47]Kenneth Benne, "Collaboration in Work Settings," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science Vol. 13, No. 3 (July - August - September, 1977), p. 261.

[48]Tyack, The One Best System, pp. 28-9.

[49]Raymond Callahan, Education and the Cult of Efficiency (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962), p.6.

[50]Ibid., p. 15.

[51]Ibid., p. 97.

[52]Ibid., p. 109.

[53]Michael A. Katz, Class Bureaucracy and Schools (New York: Praeger Press, 1971), p. 57.

[54]Mario Fantini, "Quality Education: What Is It and How Do We Get It?" City-Wide Educational Coalition Symposiom, University of Massachusetts, Boston, April 12, 1980.

[55]Katz, Bureaucracy and Schools, p. 144.

[56]Peter Schrag, Village School Downtown: Politics and Education: A Boston Report, (Boston: Beacon Press, 1967).

[57]Ibid., p. 71.

[58]Ibid., p. 109.

[59]Charles E. Silberman, Crisis in the Classroom: The Remaking of American Education (New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, 1970), p. 181.

[60]Joyce, Educational Leadership, p. 380.

[61]Stec, Staff Development, p. 11.

[62]Ibid., p. 24.

[63]Ibid., pp. 26-27.

[64]Ibid., p. 50.

[65]Ibid., p. 73.

[66]Ibid., p. 74.

[67]Margaret LeGendre, "Mechanisms for Secondary School Change: A Case Study of the English High Teachers' Center" (Ed.D. Dissertation, University of Massachusetts), 1979.

[68]Ibid., p. 15.

[69]Ibid., p. 17.

[70]Ibid., p. 19.

[71]Ibid., p. 143.

[72]Waller, Sociology, p. 389.

[73]Dale Mann, "Making Change Happen?" Teachers College Record, Vol. 77, No. 3 (New York: Columbia University, February, 1976), p. 314; Sarason, Culture of the School; and Roland Barth, "The Principal as Staff Developer," Journal of Education, Vol. 163, No. 2 (Boston: School of Education, Boston University, Spring, 1981), p. 144.

[74]Arline Gilligan, "Relationship Between Interactive Style and Effective Leadership" Phi Delta Kappan (April, 1980), p. 567.

[75]Ray Cross, "A Description of Decision-Making Patterns of School Principals," Journal of Educational Research, Vol. 73, No. 3, (January - February, 1980), p. 154.

[76]Johnson, Principal in the 1980's.

[77]Waller, Sociology, p. 422.

[78]Jim Sweeney, "Principals vs. Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan, (April, 1980), p. 565.

[79]Pick, "Curriculum and the Principal," p. 10.

[80]N. Gross and A.E. Trask, The Sex Factor and the Management of Schools (New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1976), p. 219.

[81]Ibid., p. 221.

[82]Michael Timpane, "View from America - Current Research and Effective Schools," Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin, Vo. XXV, No. 1, Fall, 1980, p. 14.

[83]Donald L. Walters, "The Measurement of Administrative Competencies," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 61, No. 6 (February, 1980), p. 424.

[84]Donald E. Walker, The Effective Administrator. Reviewed in Phi Delta Kappan by W. Patrick Leonard (April, 1980), p. 571.

[85]Neal Gross and Robert E. Herriot, Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry (New York: John Wiley and Sons Inc., 1965), p. 150.

[86]Ibid., p. 155.

[87]Ibid., p. 157.

[88]Robert L. Saunders, et al, A Theory of Educational Leadership (Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc. 1966); Sarason, Introduction.

[89]Philip T. West and Jane Armstrong, "Charisma: Studying Its Elusive Nature," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 64 (October, 1980), pp. 70-7.

[90]Ibid., p. 77.

[91]MacGregor, Human Side, p. 179.

[92]Sarason, Culture, p. 133.

[93]Ralph White and Ronald Lippitt, Autocracy and Democracy: An Experimental Inquiry (New York: Harper and Bros., 1960).

[94]Michael Rutter, et al, Fifteen Thousand Hours (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979).

[95]Ibid., pp. 135-139.

[96]David Tyack, "Urban Education: Is Bureaucratic Leadership Possible?" Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin Vol XXV, No. 1 (Fall, 1980), p. 38.

[97]Joseph F. Rogus and Mary Martin, "Principals and Staff Development: Countering the School Culture," Clearing House, Vol. 53, No. 1 (September, 1979), p. 28.

[98]Goodlad, Facing the Future, p. 175.

[99]Ibid., p. 192.

[100]Ann Lieberman and Lynne Miller, eds. Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives(New York: Teacher College Press, Columbia University, 1978).

[101]Berman and McLaughlin, Innovations, 1978.

[102]Bruce McPherson "Are They In Roses? Teachers and Staff Development" Journal of Education (Boston University) Vol. 163, No. 2, (Spring 1981), p. 120-133.

[103]Robert T. Williams, "Teacher Motivation and Satisfaction," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin 62 (December, 1978), pp. 89-94.

[104]Barth, "Principal as Staff Developer," p. 161.

[105]William T. Bailey and Daniel C. Neale, "Teachers and School Improvement," Educational Forum Vol. XLV, No. 1 (November, 1980), p. 72.

[106]Schmuck, Organizational Development, p. 3.

[107]Bentzen, Magic Feather, p. 21.

[108]Ibid.

[109]Vincent Crockenberg and Woodrow W. Clark, Jr. "Teacher Participation in School Decision Making: The San Jose Teacher Involvement Project," Phi Delta Kappan (October, 1979), p. 115-118.

[110]Betty McDermott, "We Are All In This Together," Thrust Vol. 10, No. 1 (October, 1980), p. 30-1.

[111]Goodlad, What Schools Are For, p. 69.

[112]William T. Bailey and Leslie Morrill, "Improving Instruction Through Research Based Staff Development," Educational Technology Vol XV, No. 9 (September, 1980), pp. 41-3.

[113]Barnard, Hall, Steers.

[114]Argyris.

[115]Leonard O. Pellicer and Gyuri Nemeth, "Tired of Carrying the World on Your Shoulders? Try Team Management," National Association of Secondary School Principals 64 (November, 1980), pp. 97-102; Gerald H. Moeller and David J. Mahan, The Faculty Team: School Organization for Results (Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1971); and Bailey and Neal, "Teachers and School Improvement."

[116]Pellicer and Nemeth.

[117]Ibid., p. 101.

[118]Bailey and Neale, p. 72.

[119]Lloyd A. DuVall and Kenneth A. Erickson, "School Management Teams: What Are They and How Do They.Work?" National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin Vol. 65, No. 445 (May, 1981), p. 62.

[120]Ibid.

[121]Ibid.

[122]Barbara Nadler and Myrna Merrow, "Collaboration: A Model For Survival For Schools of Education," Journal of Education, Vol. 162, No. 4 (Boston: Boston University Press (Fall, 1980), p. 140.

[123]Christopher Keys and Jean M. Bartunek "OD in Schools: Goal Agreement Process Skills and Diffusion of Change," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, Vol. 15, No. 1 (Jan-Feb-Mar, 1979) pp. 61-78.

[124]Richard A. Schmuck, and Philip J. Runkel, Organizational Training for a School Faculty, (Eugene, Ore.: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration), 1970.

[125]Sarason, Culture.

[126]Richard W. Woodman and John J. Sherwood, "Effects of Team Development Intervention: A Field Experiment," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science Vol. 16, No. 2 (April/May/June, 1980), pp. 211-27.

[127]Ibid., p. 219.

[128]"Collaboration in Work Settings," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 1977.

[129]Al Alschuler, in "Collaboration in Work Settings" p. 325.

[130]Donald Carew, et al, in "Collaboration in Work Settings" p. 436.

[131]David Crandall in "Collaboration in Work Settings," p. 437.

[132]Dee Appley and Alvin Winder in "Collaboration in Work Settings," p. 447.

C H A P T E R I I I

PROGRAM DESIGN AND OPERATION

The Development of the Team Concept

The Boston Secondary Schools Program was developed from the collaboration which began in 1975 between the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts in Amherst and the largest secondary school of the Boston School System, the English High School. Although school change was the intent of the University personnel and the high school administration, courses were generally designed to meet individual needs of staff members, rather than focusing on the needs of the school as a whole. Although staff members were receiving graduate credit and some were involved in degree programs, periodic evaluations did not indicate that the collaboration was having an impact on improving the school as a whole. During the third year of the collaboration in 1978, administrators from the high school along with University personnel formed a Teachers' Center at the school in order to reach a larger number of faculty at the school.[1] The collaboration also won the American Association of Colleges of Teacher Education Award under the leadership of Associate Dean Richard J. Clark, Jr. At the same time, another Boston high school was invited to

participate in course offerings at the Teachers' Center because of its similarity in terms of size and student population and because it would give both faculties the opportunity to have exchange visits between the two schools. In addition, as administrators from the English High School were promoted or transferred to other Boston schools, they requested that the University extend its services to them, particularly for those who were enrolled in degree programs. In September, 1979, faculty members from the School of Education designed a seminar for all administrators who had been enrolled in course work with the University. This group, which numbered eight and represented seven schools in the Boston School System met each week during the Spring semester in order to develop a plan for expanding the collaboration effort to the new schools which would focus on the needs of these schools in addition to the individual needs of the participants.

With Robert Wood as Superintendent and Dean Mario Fantini as chief consultant, six University faculty members and administrators from seven Boston schools planned a new staff development approach based on the establishment of school-based teams which would work on school problems and develop solutions and earn graduate degree credit from the University for this work. This new design, known as the Boston Secondary Schools Program, was based on conclusions

emerging from educational research as well as discussions during the planning seminar. It focused on the school as the most important unit of change for a school system. It recognized the pivotal role of the principal in any successful change effort by establishing the headmaster as the team leader. And it endorsed the findings of the study of London urban schools in 15,000 Hours by Rutter, et al that individual schools within a system can make a difference for their students in terms of intellectual, emotional, and social growth by an awareness and control of the variables which have an impact on positive student outcomes.[2]

More specifically, the design of the new Program called for two components: one part of the design was to support headmasters and other building administrators in managing more efficiently by developing a team at their schools which would share in some decision-making and develop long-range plans for their schools, rather than day-to-day crisis management. The other component in the design was the development of teachers as resource networks or teams within the schools with the opportunity to apply their talents and skills to school-wide issues beyond their classroom doors. The Boston Secondary Schools Program provided participants with a vehicle to earn graduate degree credits through working on school problems with the

building administrators and the faculty from the University.[3]

Program Operation

All participants met every Monday afternoon during the 1980-1981 school year from 3:00 to 5:30 P.M. at the President's Office of the University of Massachusetts at 250 Stuart Street in Boston. In addition, all participants met for one full day per semester at the Amherst campus for a "mini-sabbatical." Also, school teams met in their schools each week for approximately two hours.

During the Monday meetings the format varied between presentations and discussions with the team members. After each Monday meeting, all headmasters and/or team leaders met with the faculty from the University to discuss the progress of the teams and to plan future activities. During these Monday sessions, there were opportunities for teams from different schools to interact with one another in both formal exercises and in informal conversations.

All participants registered for two courses during the Fall semester of 1980: Education 713: "Planning for Urban Schools," and Education 615: "Workshop in Education." In these courses the participants were trained in a problem-solving device known as the "Key Results Plan."

This technique requires problem solvers to follow three basic steps in solving problems:

1. To state the problem in terms of its future solution; that is, as if it had been solved;
2. To state the current condition;
3. To list the intermediate improvements or the steps which must be taken in order to reach the Key Results.

Other processes which were developed by Organizational Development trainers and consultants such as the Force Field Analysis were also demonstrated for team members. They also read and discussed the longitudinal study of twelve inner London secondary schools reported in 15,000 Hours[4] and researched current literature to suggest ideas and practices which may be pertinent to the individual schools in moving toward their specific solutions for the schools. Team-building exercises and discussions of team operations were other activities for the Fall semester.

The faculty of the University set up periodic requirements which were designed to help the teams focus on issues and test their assumptions. For example, one of the first assignments was a paper in which team members would: (1) give some description of the team operation; (2) describe how the team was set up; (3) describe the decision-making process used; (4) name the group leader or facilitator; and (5) discuss the goal or Key Results Plan

which they were addressing. The faculty also met with individual teams and acted as facilitators to assist teams when difficulties arose. They also visited the teams at their schools.

The first "mini-sabbatical" was held in December, 1980 on the Amherst campus. Each team leader presented the Key Results Plan which they would implement during the Spring semester, 1981. Presentations were made by additional faculty members from the School of Education on topics such as "Teacher Burnout" and "Increasing Parental Participation in the Schools."

During the Spring semester, 1981, the teams implemented Key Results Plans to address the following problems which they had identified for their schools:

- Setting up organizational systems in the school and improving communication
- improving student tardiness
- determining the reasons for the high drop-out rate of students
- informing students of the new graduation requirements
- improving school climate by comparing the variables discussed in 15,000 Hours which have a positive impact on student outcomes
- developing a five year plan for the new vocational center
- experimenting with behavior modification techniques for disruptive students.

In addition, the University set up evaluation teams composed of team members from different schools which set up their own evaluation design and applied it to a school they evaluated. School teams then modified or redefined their Key Results Plans based on the results of the evaluation. This provided team members with the opportunity to work with faculty from all of the participating schools, to visit one anothers' schools, to provide constructive feedback from their peers, and to upgrade their Key Results Plans.

The Spring mini-sabbatical was held on April 3-4, 1981 on the Amherst campus. In addition to team presentations on the progress of their Key Results Plans, each team produced a videotape of their Plans. These videotapes were reviewed by all participants.

Three written assignments were required at the end of the Spring semester to help both the University faculty and the team participants to examine the program from three different vantage points:

> Paper 1 was a critical analysis of the program itself in terms of its structure and leadership and a comparison with other staff development, inservice, or "professional growth" programs which the participants had experienced;
>
> Paper 2 was a description of the team member's role as they perceived it in terms of both personal and team accomplishments;

Paper 3 was a personal analysis and projection for the short and long-term future of the program. These Fall and Spring course papers, the Key Results Plans, and the videotapes are analyzed in Chapter V in the findings of this study.

Purpose of the Study

As the review of the literature in Chapter II indicated, there is substantial research on various staff development models but very little data has been collected and analyzed on the model of a faculty team. This study is an attempt to analyze seven school-based teams composed of both teachers and administrators during the first year of the implementation of this model in an urban school system in collaboration with a School of Education of a University. The purpose of this analysis is to determine the set of conditions which increase the probability for the teams to be effective in achieving school improvements during the first year of implementation.

To achieve this purpose, the following areas were studied concerning the team, based on a review of the literature on staff development and school improvement strategies, organizational development applications, collaboration models, small group dynamics and leadership studies.

1. The quantity and quality of the team meetings;
2. The history of participant experiences with the University as an intervention agent for change;
3. The choice of a problem;
4. The method of choice;
5. The handling of conflict;
6. The form of recruitment of team members;
7. The form of choosing a team leader;
8. The perception of team effectiveness by participants and non-participants in the schools;
9. The style of leadership on the teams and in the school;
10. The amount of networking and resource sharing among team members and outside the teams;
11. The dynamics of the teams in terms of how task and maintenance functions were handled by the group;
12. The amount of risk-taking team members would show;
13. The decision-making processes used by the team;
14. The sense of commitment participants felt in regard to their team membership;
15. The ability of a team to evaluate its progress.

A set of twenty interview questions was developed from these factors in order to determine how each team was dealing with these areas and if their response to these factors were different and led to different levels of success or failure in terms of team outcomes. These questions and the methods used to conduct interviews with

the participants and non-participants is elaborated in Chapter IV, Methodology. Other sources of data for the study are also explained as well as the procedures used to analyze the data.

Delimitations of the Study

This study does not attempt to evaluate the results of having teams in schools and their effect on school improvements because the program was in operation for only one year. As the Rand Corporation research has proven, the average number of years for a new program to be successfully implemented in a school is five years.[5] It is also not an analysis of the role of the intervention agent, the University, in its collaboration with the schools, although its role with the teams is acknowledged as an important factor. This role and its impact on the teams is discussed in Chapter VI, The Conclusions, in terms of how the teams responded to the University as a resource.

Operational Definitions

Effective Teams: Rensis Likert's analysis of the effective group in New Patterns of Management lists the following characteristics from research on effective groups:[6]

- familiar and relaxed working conditions;
- confidence of members in both the leader and fellow members;
- openness to innovation and change;
- supportive atmosphere of group interaction;
- maximum contribution of all members in decision-making;
- integration of individual and group values and goals;
- open communication;
- creative use of conflict;
- measurement of performance.

Effective school teams are defined by the degree to which they demonstrate these characteristics.

Staff Development: Any organized, non-violent techniques to change or influence people to improve the quality of life.[7] Inservice education refers more specifically to teacher training workshops characteristically held as part of the school year's operation.

Organizational Development: A staff training model or a retraining model which attempts to integrate the needs of the individual for growth and development with the goals and objectives of the organization. It is the expression of a philosophy and a way of life. It begins with a diagnosing of the roadblocks which prevent the release of

human potential within the organization, which, in this study, is the schools.[8]

Team Model: A group of teachers and administrators from individual schools within one school system who meet on a regular basis for the purpose of identifying school problems and developing plans of action or Key Results to solve those problems.

School Improvement: Any measure or gain in desired student outcomes such as improved achievement scores, decreased absenteeism and tardiness; or indications of an improved school climate such as a lack of graffiti and vandalism. School improvements could also be indicated by improved communication among teachers and administrators, decreased faculty tardiness and absenteeism and voluntary participation on committees. Increased parental support and community pride in the schools are two other indicators of school improvement.

Power: Increased access to resources, the ability to get things done, to mobilize resources, to influence decisions and outcomes as measured by the perceptions of the participants to share in the decision-making, to share in the responsibilities resulting from decisions, and an increase in the sharing of resources.[9]

Key Results Plan: A problem-solving technique which requires planning for the results or the solution in order to determine the steps which must be taken to arrive at that solution.

Footnotes

[1]Stec "Staff Development," and LeGendre, "Case Study."

[2]Rutter, et al, Fifteen Thousand Hours.

[3]See Appendix A.

[4]See Appendix C: Course Syllabi.

[5]Mann, "Making Change Happen?".

[6]Rensis Likert, New Patterns of Management (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.), 1961.

[7]Horace Reed, Class Notes, 1979.

[8]Knox, Power or Pawn, 1977.

[9]Kanter, Men and Women p. 164.

C H A P T E R I V

METHODOLOGY

Introduction

In order to analyze the conditions necessary for the effective functioning of the teams, data were collected from September, 1980 through July, 1981 from the following sources:

1. Participant observation of teams during the Fall and Spring Monday classes, team meetings, and mini-sabbaticals;

2. Interviews were conducted with team participants, some non-team members from the participating schools, all headmasters from the participating schools; University faculty members who facilitated the Program, one outside consultant from Digital Equipment Corporation, and the former Superintendent of Schools, Robert C. Wood.

3. Course papers written by individual participants, team progress reports and videotapes were analyzed;

4. Team evaluation reports on the progress of other teams and the University's role in the Program;

5. Participant observation of planning seminars for team leaders;

6. Questionnaires to all participants (anonymous).

This chapter examines the measurements and the procedures which were followed in order to analyze the above sources of data.

Subjects

Six high schools and one middle school of the Boston Public School System invited faculty members to participate in the Boston Secondary Schools Program, a collaboration project directed by faculty members from the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts. During the school year under study, five headmasters and seventy-five teachers enrolled in the Program from September, 1980 to June, 1981. Each participating school formed teams composed of both teachers and administrators. The work of the teams was directed through participation in two graduate level courses which were conducted weekly in Boston by six University faculty members. An additional planning seminar was conducted for all team leaders. Of the seven participating schools, two headmasters did not enroll in the Program but did allow their administrative designees to lead teams.

Measurements and Procedures

The Interviews. In order to conduct this qualitative research study of the school-based teams, in-depth interview questions were developed and the interviews were conducted from March, 1981 to July, 1981. During this

phase of the study, the author was assisted by a Research Assistant from the University of Massachusetts' School of Education. Under an agreement with the Director of the Program, all data collected became the property of the School of Education and can be used for further research projects at the discretion of the Program Director of the School of Education.

Open-ended interviews were conducted by the two co-researchers; that is, the same interview questions were used but the order of the questions was developed as the interviews proceeded in order to maintain a conversational atmosphere between the interviewer and the participant.

Interviewer Qualifications. The research assistant was a doctoral candidate of the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts at the time of this study. As a part of her doctoral study, she received training in interviewing techniques in a graduate level course on "Qualitative Research." Her career in Education spanned over thirty years.

The author received Human Relations training in a desegregation project directed by Max Birnbaum and Kenneth Benne, two of the many founders of the National Training Laboratory. For specific interview training, participation in the evaluation teams for the New England Association of

Schools and Colleges for the accreditation of several New England secondary schools provided the experience of eliciting information from staff members to evaluate schools as organizations. As Assistant Headmaster of the largest high school in the Boston Public School System, interviews were used periodically with staff members to determine staff and curriculum development needs.

The Interview Questions. The interview questions were developed jointly by the co-researchers and were critiqued in a graduate seminar at the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts. The questions were designed using the Second Handbook of Organizational Development in Schools by Richard Schmuck and others[1] and other works researched in Chapter II. Each interview question was related to an Organizational Development variable as identified by Schmuck and other researchers. Some of those variables were: the sense of commitment expressed by team members and demonstrated at team meetings in terms of staying late at team meetings, increasing the required number of meetings; the ability of team members to articulate the team goals clearly; the location of the decision-maker for the school and the team; the type of decision-making; evidence of any risk-taking by team members and the extent of sharing on the team; the

leadership styles apparent at team meetings; the trust level of the group; the perception of success of the team on the part of team members.

Both co-researchers used a brainstorming technique to create a pool of research questions which could be used on both the questionnaires to be distributed at the end of the study and for the interviews that were conducted during the program implementation. Feedback on the interview questions was solicited from both the graduate seminar and from three program participants who were no longer connected to the Program. After collecting feedback from these sources, twenty interview questions were chosen by the co-researchers. These questions were used with all participants chosen at random from the Program, both teachers and administrators. Five different questions were designed for non-participating headmasters and teachers and four additional questions were designed for the interviews with University faculty members.[2]

Selection of Participants in the Interview Process. Participants from all seven schools were interviewed. The number of interviews for each school was proportionate to the size of the school team which ranged from three to twelve members over the two semesters. Names were drawn at random. After a random selection was made of every school

team, a list was compiled and additional names were added to insure that a broad representation of participants had been reached (i.e., representative race, sex, maturity in the Program). Thirty-five names were selected at random and four more were added to provide a fair representation of the constituency of the teams. Letters were then sent to these team members explaining the purpose of the study and including a notice regarding privacy rights and all participants were requested to sign release of information forms.[3]

In addition to randomly selected participants, all headmasters at the participating schools were interviewed, including the two who had chosen not to participate in the Program. All Program participants who functioned as team leaders were also interviewed.

Methods of Recording. Two methods of recording the interview responses were used, depending on the permission of the participants to use a tape recorder. Out of the total 45 interviews conducted, seven were recorded using a field notebook and all others were recorded on tape and then transcribed by a typist. Both researchers kept logs during the field research to keep records on the overall structure of the interviews, location, timing, nature of the interaction with the participant, and other

serendipidous material. Names of participants and schools were expunged from the transcriptions to preserve confidentiality for the participants. All schools were therefore coded in the transcripts. Interviewing was chosen as the primary source of research data because intensive interviewing was the most helpful method when examining issues of process, of how decisions were made, how the program had evolved for participants, and to gather evidence on group process and other complex variables. Both researchers made different contributions to this effort: the author as a member of both the school system and as a participant in the University Program could enlist the trust of the participants and the research assistant as a person outside the school system could provide more objectivity.

The Questionnaire. The second method used in the field research was the distribution of a questionnaire at the end of the Spring semester.[4] The questions were developed to collect data in the following areas: participant data relevant to backgrounds in education, in collaboration with the University, and specific Program participants; team meetings as perceived by the participants; and data concerning perceptions of leadership styles and the impact on the teams. A Likert scale[5] was used to measure

participant attitudes regarding the team process as well as its work. Open-ended questions were also used to elicit participants' comments on the team approach. A separate page was developed for team members to collect data on leadership styles and their working relationship with their headmasters or team leaders. This questionnaire was also critiqued in the same graduate seminar which had reviewed the interview questions. It was then pilot tested with three people, two of whom had been in the Program during the first semester only and one who was just beginning in the Spring semester. As a result of the pilot testing, the question regarding the relationship which a teacher would choose as most characteristic of that with his or her headmaster was changed. The format was also improved to make it easier to fill out.

Method of Distribution. The questionnaires were distributed in two ways. At the last class of the Spring semester, 1981, 26 questionnaires were distributed to all participants in attendance and all 26 were returned. The class attendance was low due to the fact that it coincided with the exam schedule in the schools and also because it was announced previously that the purpose of the last class was primarily social. Therefore, an additional 44 questionnaires were mailed to those participants not in

attendance. They were mailed with return envelopes which were color coded to determine the rate of return by enrollment in the Program, since a number of the participants in the Fall semester had chosen not to continue for the Spring semester and their data were important to analyze. Also, a number of new participants had just begun in the Spring semester and did not have the same amount of experience with the Program. All questionnaires were filled out anonymously. Of the 44 questionnaires which were mailed, 14 were returned. Therefore, 40 of the 70 distributed or 57% of all questionnaires were returned for analysis. Two of the 40 returned were blank leaving 38 questionnaires or 54% of the total disbursed to be analyzed. Data are analyzed in Chapter VI.

Program Documents. The following Program documents were read and incorporated into the findings of the study. They were: Key Result Plans of the school teams; papers written by individual participants as part of their course requirements both for the Fall and Spring semesters; and team progress reports.

Participant Observation. In addition to access to the program documents, the author was a participant of the

Program during the Fall semester of this study and functioned as a team leader for her school. After approval of the proposal to study this team process as a dissertation study, the author dropped out of the team in order to observe all teams at the Monday sessions, the sabbaticals, and at some of the actual team meetings at the school. Field notes were recorded from these observations and were used to reinforce the findings from the interviews. Therefore, the interviews, the questionnaires, and the year-long observation of these teams in action formed a triangular approach to this study.

Analysis of the Data

After the transcription of all the interviews, schools and the team participants were coded. Each interview was represented on a chart and questions were rearranged so that responses to the same questions could be analyzed from the perspective of all those interviewed. As this process progressed, recurring themes began to emerge. A preliminary draft of the findings was written. A similar process was used with data from the questionnaires and field notes from observations. In order to treat the data in a uniform process, a model or a series of steps were developed which was adapted from the model described by

Paul Bernstein in his analysis of two dozen worker-owned plywood mills in the Pacific Northwest.[6] In his study of democracy in the workplace, Bernstein collected data using interviewing, observation, and company records. His process of analysis of this data was inductive and consisted of the assemblage of his data as case studies. From these case studies he then analyzed them for underlying principles and generated a minimal set of fundamental components necessary for democratization to succeed. By using similar steps to view the school teams, five conditions emerged which are necessary for the effective functioning of teacher-administrator teams in schools. These conditions and their interacting nature are examined in Chapter V.

Footnotes

[1]Schmuck, Organizational Development.

[2]For the interview questions see Appendix D.

[3]For copies of this correspondence see Appendix E.

[4]See Appendix F: Questionnaire Form.

[5]A.N. Oppenheim, Questionnaire Design and Attitude Measurement.

[6]Bernstein, Democratization, p.2.

C H A P T E R V

THE TEAMS

Organization of the Chapter

As outlined in Chapter I, the seven schools which participated in the Boston Secondary Schools Program shared several characteristics and problems typical of public schools in an urban environment. However, though belonging to the same public school system, each was unique in terms of the size of their faculties, the size and demographic make-up of their student populations, the size and condition of the facilities in which they operated, their designation as either a district or a magnet school, and their mission in terms of their purpose, for example, one of the seven schools was the city's vocational training center accessible to all students and another was a middle school, serving students from grades 6 through 8.

The teams from each of the seven schools varied in several ways including their size, their leadership and the style of leadership, their method of recruitment and the proportion of teachers and administrators on the teams, the type of problem they chose, and the history of collaboration with the University.

Therefore, in order to begin the analysis of the data,

this chapter will present evidence from the following sources to provide information on the schools, their teams, and their effectiveness as teams after one year of program implementation:

1) A descriptive profile of each school;

2) Information on the teams from the interviews;

3) The Key Results Plans;

4) Evaluation data from peers on Key Results Plans;

5) Evaluation data from team papers on their teams and the University Program;

6) Summary analysis from the above data sources using the following Organizational Development variables as they operated for each team:

   a) collaboration or competition as a norm of the team;

   b) the type of reward system experienced by team members;

   c) opportunities for assuming new roles for team members;

   d) the type of problem-solving climate reported by team members;

   e) the level of trust apparent on the team;

   f) the extent to which the team was able to integrate individual needs of team members for professional growth with organizational needs for improvement.

In the conclusion of this Chapter, the questionnaire data are presented including a more specific profile of the backgrounds of the team members and develops general themes

for the teams as extrapolated from the questionnaire findings.

School A: The Vocational Center

Descriptive Profile. School A opened in 1980 as the new vocational training and resource center serving students throughout the city from grades nine through twelve. The faculty is composed of vocational/occupational teachers who instruct and train students in nine occupational areas or "clusters." They are supported by a special Curriculum and Staff Development Support Team, which is made up of experienced teachers who have been placed on assignment to support the classroom and shop work for the vocational teachers. This Curriculum and Staff Development Support Team is unique to this school and its members have no classroom teaching responsibilities. In addition to this support, each of the nine occupational clusters has an Advisory Committee formed by citizens from the community, business, labor, and industry who collectively advise educators at the Center on the planning, implementation, and evaluation of vocational/occupational programs for the students' needs as well as the community's.

At the time of this study, there were 125 faculty members which included cluster teachers, support staff, and

school administrators serving a population of 2337 students who were enrolled in both half-day and week/in-week/out programs.

Information From Interviews. Most of the faculty were composed of teachers and administrators who had worked in other Boston Public Schools and had transferred voluntarily to work in this new facility. Three of these faculty members had been enrolled in the University graduate degree program of the School of Education at their previous schools and were, therefore, familiar with the University program prior to the start of the team course under the Boston Secondary Schools Program. One of these faculty members was the headmaster of another Boston Public School who was at that time on a special one-year assignment to oversee the opening of the new facility. He had also participated in the planning seminar conducted by the University during the previous school year in which the team course concept had been developed. These three, therefore, invited the University facilitators to introduce the team concept to the entire faculty. However, there was initial confusion as to the membership of the team at this school and also, due to time constraints at the start of the school year, many on the faculty were not introduced to the team course in time for Fall registration. Since it

was impossible to orient all faculty members to the team course in the Fall, the school's Director of Curriculum and Staff Development decided to delay faculty recruitment until the Spring semester, 1981. Nevertheless, the three faculty members who previously had been enrolled in the University degree program attempted to form a team in the Fall. The headmaster began as a team leader, but he became an 'ex officio' member by mid-semester due to his new assignment and the heavy schedule required of him in opening this new facility. The remaining two members could not function as a team, so they chose to contract for Independent Study with University personnel. In this capacity, they worked on the organizational chart for the new school. In the Spring semester, one of them recruited a new team for the school.

Nine people joined the team in the Spring. Six of these team members were interviewed, in addition to the headmaster. This team membership did not represent a cross-section of the entire faculty because only one member was a classroom teacher from the clusters. All other members were part of the Curriculum and Staff Development Support Staff, including its Director. Since the team was composed of faculty members who worked together as a team during the school day, with the exception of the classroom teacher, the team members interviewed reported a strong

cohesiveness and trust, and had the ability to take risks during team meetings. For example, during one conflict they reported using a "T" group exercise to resolve their problem. This group cohesiveness, on the other hand, could prevent the team's work from having a direct impact on the school. All who were interviewed responded that the other faculty members in the school were not aware of what they were trying to accomplish as a team or even that they existed.

The factor of leadership was unique at this school. The headmaster was neither a leader nor a member of this team. He was characterized as being very supportive of the team, however, and met with the team leaders periodically. They also communicated with him by memos. This team had two people sharing the leadership role, each with specific areas of responsibility. One was the liaison to the University and participated in all team leader seminars and the other functioned as the in-house team leader responsible for agendas and school-based meetings. In all seven interviews, the leadership was characterized as democratic and efficient. Although the administrator of this support staff was a team member, he was not the leader. He did not want this role nor did other members want him in that role. He and other members also stated that they felt the team did more sharing because the

headmaster was not there. Some who were interviewed said that some of his involvement was desired so that the team would have more access to top decision-makers. The headmaster expressed the notion that he should be providing the leadership or at least periodically give them a "shot in the arm."

The Key Results Plan. The Key Results Plan was actually a four-year plan which focused on the steps that needed to be taken by the Center in order to make the core mission statement of the Center a reality for the city. The Key Result, or anticipated outcome for this plan was to have a model center for the city which could provide students with job-readiness skills and competencies which fulfilled both the students' needs for training and the community's needs for employable students. To reach this goal, the team envisioned a plan for an on-going problem-solving process at all levels of the organization. This team reported in the interviews that they were having a great deal of difficulty with the process of implementing their Key Results Plan. To break the deadlock, one of their team leaders used a technique of "mapping" the learning and decision-making preferences of all team members. This information was shared among the group and new ways of group discussion and information-sharing were used to

accommodate all team members. All of those interviewed commented on the supportive nature of their team and a strong commitment to their long-term Key Results Plan. The lack of headmaster involvement at this point was mitigated by the fact that two line management administrators were members of the team.

Evaluation of Key Results Plan by Peers. By the middle of the Spring semester, evaluation teams consisting of people from other school teams were assigned by the University to evaluate one anothers' Key Results Plans. Three faculty members from another school evaluated the Plan of School A and reported that their four year Plan was too vague and too large. After lengthy discussions with the evaluation teams and University facilitators, the team from School A revised their Plan into several intermediate improvements which could be completed in one year and which would contribute to their overall goal. Team members reported achieving a better perspective on their work since the new Plan focused in specific areas such as curriculum development and production, the integration of the Advisory Committees into curriculum planning, and the development of job placement procedures for all students.

Evaluation Data on the Teams and the University. Despite the fact that all but one team member worked closely with each other during the day, many stated in their interviews that the team model of the University Program gave them new insights into other team members. The in-house leader was complimented for her emerging leadership capabilities and one team member was cited by several interviewed for his "valuable philosophical insights," which many said had not come to light during any of the regular inservice sessions that they participated in during the year. Another said, "There has been a shift in working relations on the team since the U.Mass. Program, we have 'melded'." For team members, the satisfying aspects have been the Key Results process itself, which, as one member stated, had, "for all its static, increased my ability to work with people." For the team member who was also the Director of Curriculum and Staff Development, there was "validation of a lot of ideas I had . . . the team became a support group for me." And another team member said that the team experience was good for "being together and sharing common concerns and getting out of your specialty and getting a different perspective . . . it's good to think long range with competent people."

Some frustrations stated in many interviews were the work load for staff members already overloaded, the lack of expressed goals and structure to the Program, and several

wanted more of an intellectual challenge imposed on them from the University facilitators. As one team member said, "They don't ask enough of us." Also mentioned as unsatisfactory was the lack of a good cross-representation of teachers and administrators on the team. The team also asked for more support from the University faculty and a sharing of the University's Key Results Plan for the team program.

Although this team had only one semester's experience in the Program, and reported that as late as March, 1981 that they were still in the process of team building, the evidence showed that the time spent in this process was valuable to them, although it may have slowed the progress of their Key Results Plan. As one member wrote in her concluding Spring Semester paper:

> Our team is a good one. The very healthy give and take among team members attained unexpected dimensions as we amended a previous [Key Results] statement . . . We are working together, learning how to respect time commitments, how to accept and to proffer needed help and constructive criticism. Although we had a modest amount of difficulty working as a group, we have been more and more accepting of each others' differences and are trying to work well within the group structure.

Another team member stated similar themes in her Spring report, asking specifically for more "human relations techniques that can be used to accomplish my goals which

are to get 27 teachers to write curriculum . . . I want more problem-solving techniques. We need approaches that will work on drawing in these other people at our school."

Summary Analysis Using Organizational Development Variables. Collaboration rather than competition was evident in this team in several ways. First there was the decision on leadership for the team. The present headmaster was not an active participant in the team and the administrator with authority over the group purposely chose not to be the team leader. One team member was an advanced degree candidate with the University and, according to the University Program design, the leadership of the team would have been her legitimate role, yet she preferred to share it, stating that she felt the group should choose its leader. It therefore evolved from a team discussion that there would be a sharing of leadership responsibilities, one person acting as liaison with the University during the team leader seminars and the other performing more in-house duties such as preparing agendas and running meetings. Collaboration was also evident in the sharing of team resources, not only the skill of the in-house leader in "mapping" team member learning preferences but also in the consideration of the classroom teacher's point of view, expressed by the one teacher

member. As the administrator member said, "We try to be sensitive to her input and we'd like to get more teachers . . . she brings a reality into it so we use her and that's very helpful. There's a commonality of goals." The teacher member was very conscious of her role for the team, as she stated, to "bring them back to earth, I find myself doing that more and more." Collaboration was also evident in the process which the team went through in order to arrive at their Key Results Plan: "We are trying to drop our professional roles and face issues with a freshness as a total group."

Several members of the team spoke of a reward system which they had experienced through working with the team. For the administrator as team member, the team's choice of a problem validated his concepts of how curriculum should be approached for the school. For one team leader, recognition of her leadership abilities was evident in several interviews. For the teacher member, respect for her perspective. She also expressed an increased sense of sharing of organizational objectives. When asked what was the most satisfying aspect of her team involvement, she stated,

> It's being together and sharing concerns common about the school and I think it's good to get out of your individual specialty and be able to look at things from a different perspective because here [in the classroom]

> we are insulated in our own individual cluster and you get involved with your own particular cluster problems so it's seeing it in a different perspective and I think it's good. It's also good to work with an unusually competent set of people and sharing and working on a fairly high level of thought and abstraction without getting down into everyday things like scheduling but working on a long term idea.

Many reported in the interviews that the problem-solving climate for the team had been very tense at the beginning of their work. Although they used a brainstorming technique, they could not reach a consensus on what to choose for their Key Results Plan. They used the resources of their own team members to help them move to a decision. Because of this ability, the team leader's role was strengthened through her knowledge rather than through her title as leader. One member said, "Our team has strong leadership. She is very supportive and able to articulate what's happening in the group because of her skills . . . certainly she has become much more of a leader, I didn't realize until the U.Mass. team how much leadership ability she had." There was evidence in several interviews of a great deal of sharing of personal resources and many pointed out that the team members showed different sides to them that were not evident in any of their regular staff meetings. And many expressed feeling freer to express opinions without the headmaster present at their

meetings, saying that his authority of role might interfere with their freedom of expression.

Trust was very apparent in this team. Although some stated there was no conflict, another team member related an account of one team meeting in which there developed a major conflict over the group attendance at the mini-sabbatical: "People needed space, personal time, and some misinterpreted that as rejection so therefore we dealt with that in a "T" group fashion." The ability of the team to take that risk was attributed to the fact that the team also works together all day, except for the teacher member: "we have a trust built beyond the U.Mass. team."

For the team at School A, integration of individual needs for growth and development with the goals of the organization was achieved through the mechanism of the team. The school improvement plan expressed in their Key Results Plan was a four year plan to bring the mission statement for the new school to five areas of implementation. Several team members interviewed expressed a definite commitment to this plan and to the team concept "My ability to work with people - my independence is high - but my ability has increased . . . because weekly you have to process, you can't avoid interaction, you have to resolve or flee, wrestle and learn more. I certainly feel a responsibility to the team." For another member, the

idea of "studying for a degree by working together on problems or issues that are directly involved with everyday processes as opposed to studying things that probably have no bearing on everyday issues" was cited as a positive aspect of the team design.

School B: The Tower Magnet School

Descriptive Profile. School B is one of the oldest public high schools in the United States. In the time between 1970 and 1975, it went through drastic changes: admitting female students and teachers for the first time; moving into a new ten story "tower" building, and becoming a city-wide "magnet" school as part of the federal desegregation case court order of Judge W. Arthur Garrity. In that same court order, the faculty was directed to develop a Theatre and Performing Arts curriculum as their magnet theme in order to attract students from all over the city and thereby achieve voluntary integration of the school. At the time of this study, the student population was approximately 2400 and the faculty numbered 150.

The school has the longest association with the University than any of the other schools participating in the Boston Secondary Schools Program. A collaboration was begun in 1975, based on another aspect of the federal

desegregation court order that paired every high school in the city with a college or university and a business partner. During the six years of collaboration between School B and the University, the relationship had gone through several stages. Initially the University established a graduate degree program in which participants could earn credit toward an advanced degree including a doctorate. Courses were taught at the school itself and some participants traveled to Amherst for courses on the campus or for appointments with various faculty members.[1] As the collaboration developed, a teacher center was established in order to have a wider impact on the faculty at the school.[2]

Information from Interviews. During the year of this study, this was the first time the team course concept had been offered at the school. No other electives were offered, although the Teacher Center continued to operate, offering workshops and mini-grants to teachers for special class projects. The past involvement of the University and the expectations raised by this history complicated the developmental stages of team building for the school because many faculty members were in the process of earning credits to finish their graduate degree programs, a process

which they had experienced through individual course work and independent study, rather than through a team course.

The headmaster had been a member of the planning seminar which developed the team course but he had not been a member of the faculty during the early stages of the collaboration with the University. He invited all faculty members to participate on the team, although from the interviews, there is evidence that indicates that some understood that the headmaster would choose people for the team out of this interested group. Although a large number of faculty responded, there were very different motives, some were just interested in credits for finishing their degrees, others expected a "regular course" which they had previously experienced. Only one of the nine people interviewed seemed to understand the purpose of the team course.

At the start of the Fall semester, the team consisted of nineteen (19) members and was considered too large for intense problem-solving work so they were split up into two groups. However, before splitting up, they began the process of group problem-solving by brainstorming problems that the team members felt were important to solve for the school. Members naturally suggested problems that were close to them in their daily work. In the winnowing process, two problems emerged, one which was proposed by

the headmaster and another which the group felt affected the whole school. Interviews with members of both teams indicated that the process of forming two groups after the problems had been chosen brought a number of difficulties. Members had to choose a team anonymously, so they could attempt to avoid the formation of "cliques." Those absent from the particular meeting when choices were made were assigned to one of the teams. Subsequent analysis of the data shows that no group consensus was ever achieved in either group and many dropped out after one semester. Team members expressed anger and frustration at not being able to work on what they termed their "pet peeve."

Once the two teams were formed, leadership became a problem for both groups. Although the headmaster was perceived as the team leader, he did not take an active role in the meetings of either team, according to many interviewed. Team #1 chose a teacher to represent them at the Monday seminars and to organize their school-based meetings. Team #2 initially had the headmaster as leader and he reported on the team progress during the Fall semester but team members reported having two members in their group take turns attending and running the meetings at the school. Many from Team #1 characterized their meetings as "very open, with people banding together," and spoke of their leader as a good organizer. However, others

stated that this leader was not committed to the team, citing that the leader was not present for the mini-sabbatical in Amherst in the Fall. This leader did not continue in the program Spring semester. She explained that others did not take the work of the team seriously.

The headmaster stated in his interview that he did not consider it important that the headmaster be the actual team leader, but that the team needed his consent in order to proceed with a Key Results Plan for the school. Team members viewed him as supportive of their work but one commented that, "he doesn't interact, we're more or less on our own." Some members felt that this was better because, "some may be intimidated so it's good he's not there, we enjoy working by ourselves."

The Key Results Plans. In the Fall semester, Team #1 consisted of nine members and their Key Results Plan initially involved the problem of the new graduation requirements which had to be implemented in two years throughout the city. They wanted to examine the impact of these new requirements on the curriculum and on students, especially in terms of their awareness of the new expectations. In their Fall report, this team showed indications of a sense of team spirit, using such phrases as "go team go!" in their introduction. They reported that

their first meetings were used to discuss the components of a team, roles for the team members, leadership, formal structure, and a sense of commitment: "We wanted to work on a problem that was relevant." Through brainstorming and an informal teacher survey, they listed several assumptions about why students may not meet the new graduation requirements. They also reported that the Key Results Plan proved invaluable to them.

Team #2 reported working on student attendance problems in the school. There were 10 members on this team. No progress report was available from this team on their Key Results Plan.

Once the two teams were established, they broke off all further communication between the two teams. Most did not think the rest of the faculty was aware of the work they were involved in, as indicated by the interview data. Some thought that there was some resentment by other faculty members such as from those working in the Guidance Department when one of the teams started to investigate student records, an area which they thought was their responsibility. But there was no general sharing of knowledge between the teams and the rest of the faculty. As one team member stated, "We never thought about [sharing] it, we kept to ourselves, even from the other team."

When the interviews were conducted in the Spring, 1981, Team #1 members except for one had dropped out of the Program. Many of these former team members could not remember the specific Key Results Plan which they had worked on. Some people thought that curriculum was their issue, others who had participated on the same team stated their theme as the new graduation requirements. Thus some thought their mission was to alter the curriculum in order to conform to the new city-wide requirements, whereas others on the same team stated that their mission was to inform the students, particularly the Junior Class, that the graduation requirements had changed and they no longer had to amass ninety points in order to graduate but now had to earn those ninety points in certain required courses. Thus, decision-making by consensus was not achieved.

On the other hand, most members of Team #2 continued to work in the Program during the second semester. However, they dropped their Key Results Plan of addressing the problem of student attendance in favor of continuing some of the work outlined by the defunct team. This new Spring team was composed of the headmaster and five teachers. Their new Key Results Plan indicated that they would work on informing all students in the Junior Class of the new graduation requirements so they could adjust their Senior schedule to make up for work prior to graduation. The team

argued that this target population was important to work on because they would have only one more year to take courses. The new Spring team reported that they made decisions by majority rule: "There are five of us and if three agree, it goes that way." All of the team members interviewed concurred that conflicts were not discussed in the Fall in terms of problems on the teams, yet several expressed a dislike for the team processes in their interviews.

Evaluation of the Key Results Plan by Peers. At School B, the Spring evaluation report by their peers in the team course indicated that this team had some confusion in making up its team. They also found the Spring Key Results Plan too difficult to read.

Evaluation Data on the Teams and the University. Many of the team members who had dropped out of the program at the end of the Fall semester expressed a frustration over the lack of consensus for a Plan. Some also spoke of doing extra research work for their team and then never being asked for it. No interview revealed that either team had discussed the use of outside resources and most of those interviewed from both semesters could not express that they saw any new roles, skills, or new patterns of behavior

emerge on the teams, although the headmaster commented that it gave people, including himself, a chance to "interchange with people." Spring papers submitted by individuals to the University also repeated this opportunity which the teams provided for some:

> Involvement in the course prompted increased communication with my fellow classmates, no mean accomplishment in a profession where the regular classroom teachers remain basically isolated all day. The physical size, the large student and staff population, and the ever-growing complexity of the school, the countless transitions in recent years of both administrators and teachers, and the increasing city-wide issues of budgetary nightmares and projected staff lay-offs would seem to relegate educational concerns to a minor position of interest. However, the team strategy surprisingly seems to have produced an effective strategy for encouraging and promoting group involvement in school-related issues and problems.

Another individual paper commented on the new perspective which the team approach to problem-solving had given him in viewing educational processes at the school, as well as new insights into other schools which were involved in the Program.

Despite the many frustrations expressed by team members, many were gratified by the design of the team model which allowed them, as one member said, "a chance to sit and talk with people, an opportunity for professional growth with University people instead of being bogged down in day-to-day work . . . we need the inspiration."

The team model was frustrating to the headmaster who admittedly was not a team person. Others were frustrated by time constraints of trying to meet when all members could be present and some commented on the unstructured nature of the Monday sessions conducted by the University. Other comments made in the papers regarding a critical analysis of the Program addressed the need of paying attention to the size of the problem; for example, student absenteeism was too overwhelming for one team. Composition of the team was also cited as vital to the success because of the chance to have varied perspectives. The mini-sabbaticals were also brought out in these team papers as providing an opportunity to enjoy the company of fellow teachers, one commented that, "I can recall no other course which allowed this."

Summary Analysis Using Organizational Development Variables. Collaboration was not apparent between the two teams and was not practiced within the teams, particularly during the Fall semester. Although there was evidence of competition between the two teams, it is significant that the team that remained in operation for the second semester dropped their own Key Results Plan and picked up the plan of the defunct team. Within the remaining team, there did seem to be some spirit of collaboration when members helped

one another deal with such issues as the graduation requirements as they apply to bilingual and Special Needs students.

In terms of a reward system, members of both teams in the Fall had negative experiences. As one former member said, "I had all that work done, I had to do it all, and nobody ever even wanted it . . . I'm wondering why I looked up all that information if it's just going to be for the record." Another said that she resented getting the same grade as the others because some on her team did not do their share of the work. Yet for one member who remained, who was an itinerant teacher assigned to several schools, the reward of working on the team was an increased sense of sharing of organizational objectives of the school as a whole.

It was assumed by all who were interviewed that the authority of the role of the headmaster automatically put him in the position of team leader. However, the initial size of the team in the Fall required forming two teams. This enabled one person to act as the team leader, a new role for this teacher but failure to follow through for the team at the first mini-sabbatical diminished the positive initial impression expressed by several in their interviews. There was some evidence of team members assuming new roles in the Spring semester, particularly in

terms of the two "co-chairs" who shared the leadership. One stated that he did so because of his organizational ability. Another team member stated that the team experience had revealed new skills that people had not otherwise shown. But for most of those interviewed, there was no evidence of the emergence of new roles or the sharing of personal resources among team members, most said this was because they had already worked together so long that they knew each other very well.

In terms of the climate of team meetings, several people interviewed expressed a sense of an undercurrent of conflict, particularly among members who dropped out at the end of the Fall semester. But this underlying conflict was never brought to the surface. Although one stated "we're a pretty congenial group," one person perceived that "some people just sat back and never said a word, one in particular just sat back and then criticized us." By the second semester, there was no indication that the remaining team brought up any conflicts, they used meetings as a means of exchanging information and assigning tasks but there was no evidence to suggest that the maturity of the group was advanced enough in terms of group dynamics to deal with conflicts and utilize them. Trust was not apparent in the groups, particularly once the larger group broke up into two teams. One member expressed apprehension

about picking which team to join, stating she wanted to wait and see who was on each team. Another member who dropped out of the Program at the end of the Fall semester felt some of the members of the team did not take the task seriously enough. And another described the history of the collaboration between the University and the school, explaining that the past had been marred by some distrust and that this led to a misunderstanding of the University's agenda in regard to the school, and carrying over to the team course.

School B was not successful in integrating individual needs for growth and development with the goals and objectives of the organization. Since this school has a six year history of collaboration with the University, many faculty members misinterpreted the team "course" and expected a more individualized, traditional course format which had previously been available to them through the collaboration. As one team member explained, "Some of the people first semester didn't realize what the team was all about. They weren't very happy about it. Some finished their Master's Degree, or they only needed six credits and this was an easy way to do it. A lot of people were disillusioned." Although some people stated that they wanted to earn six credits by working on school issues, they did not express school issues in terms of the

organization as a whole but rather in terms of their particular area such as Special Education.

School C: The Middle School

Descriptive Profile. School C is a middle school serving a student population in grades six through eight. There are 24 faculty members and 270 students in this small district school. The facility is one of Boston's older schools and it is located in Roxbury.

Information from Interviews. The team from this school consisted of the headmaster as team leader and six teachers, two of whom did not join the team until the Spring semester. The headmaster had been associated with the University for several years, having been enrolled in the doctoral program while assigned to another school in Boston. Unlike most of the other schools, the headmaster did not open the team course to all faculty members. Instead he chose his own team based on his own criteria: they had to have shown some ambition in working beyond their basic teaching duties for the school and they had to be compatible. The headmaster also decided on when they should meet and where, choosing an outside locale for their weekly meetings.

The leadership of the team by the headmaster was accepted without question by the team. As one person said, "The headmaster is the leader and we went along with that, he knows more [about the U.Mass. Program] and has control over his school. A teacher can't go to another teacher and say. 'Help do this thing,' only the principal can." Thus there was an acceptance of the hierarchical authority and an acceptance of the notion that teachers did not have the power to put professional demands on one another.

The headmaster also decided on new team members coming into the team. When asked if the team members had discussed the inclusion of new members on the team, one teacher member said, "It's none of our business."

The Key Results Plan. As they reported in their Fall papers, this team decided to deviate from the Key Results Plan model, preferring to use their own model which was a "Behavior Research Model" from Saul Axelrod's Behavior Modification For The Classroom Teacher, and Managing Behavior, by R. Vance Hall. Their plan involved creating a positive educational climate in the school and in the Fall semester, each team member chose an individual student and attempted to modify his or her negative school behavior by individual attention and positive reinforcement. The team meetings were used to compare notes on student progress.

In the Spring semester, this plan was expanded to include the start of a daily writing program for every student in the school. They also reported working on the following issues:

- tardiness and absenteeism - trying to change the negative norms of the students in this regard by rewards and reinforcement;
- a cross index of faculty members to identify their involvement in the school as potential resources in terms of their outside hobbies, skills, and interests;
- ongoing evaluation of their educational program by paying attention to student remarks;
- emphasizing the togetherness of the team.

Evaluation of the Key Results Plan by Peers. The evaluation team for School C was unable to make a report on the Key Results Plan due to an inability to coordinate a visit to the school.

Evaluation Data on the Teams and the University. In the three interviews conducted at this school, all team members expressed a high degree of trust for one another because, as they explained, they had worked together before on other projects for the school. They reported that no differences of opinion were expressed at team meetings and no one interviewed could cite any examples of questioning, seeing things in a new light, seeing new roles and new talents emerge from team members.

However, the team members who were interviewed in early March, 1981, and who had been in the Program since September, 1980, expressed a great deal of uncertainty and even some suspicion regarding the role of the University. They questioned the University facilitators's motives, particularly in regard to the degree program and the requirements for acceptance into the doctoral program. They were also more confused about the direction of their Key Results Plan than they had been in the Fall, as indicated in their Fall course papers. They repeated the need to have more assistance and direction from the University facilitators at every Monday seminar. By the end of the Spring semester the individual course papers from several team members indicated that they had more of an understanding of the functioning of their team and they could express outcomes for them on a personal level. There was also an indication in these papers that the headmaster had begun to share some of his leadership role with members of the team because they had begun to rotate the responsibility of representing the team at the Monday seminars. One team member wrote of the benefit of her involvement on the team in that it had forced her to look at the school as a whole and to examine what its goals and objectives can and should be. She also wrote of the opportunity the team concept had given her to get to know

some of the other teachers in the building in a more personal and professional way, and that this had carried over to teachers from other schools, and, overall, the team had "improved my sense of professionalism." There was also an indication in the Spring paper of another team member that the notion of teachers asking other teachers for help was accepted as a positive notion at this point: "Working with other staff at this school helps make you a more effective person and you are able to ask the teachers for help if you ever need it. We became a very good team and we worked well together, we helped each other in our Key Results process and, overall, the school was seen as a more enlightened place to work."

Summary Analysis Using Organizational Development Variables. Based on the data collected over the year of this study, it is evident that collaboration was apparent on this team, particularly in the Spring when various responsibilities such as setting the agendas for meetings were rotated.

Team members did not express any opinions in regard to rewards or other satisfactions with their work on the team in the interviews but the Spring papers clearly indicate that individuals reflected on many positive outcomes when summing up the year in their papers. In his interview the

headmaster stated that the team was an opportunity for him to "discuss issues as co-equals, as practitioners."

The authority of role was a strong norm for this team and perhaps accounts for their need for sustained guidance and leadership from the University facilitators. Although team members did not indicate that they had experienced team members' expressing new roles, their rotation of the leadership position in the Spring meetings demonstrated that this was taking place. Their Spring papers also indicated that they were learning new insights about one another on a more personal level than they had known prior to the team experience.

This team did not report having any conflicts in choosing a problem to work on, yet their Key Results Plan, a deviation from the original model, was at first specific in the Fall and then very generalized in the Spring, which probably accounted for the lack of outside evaluation. The fact that the headmaster had chosen all team members contributed to the lack of conflict but it could have also contributed to the lack of results for the school as a whole. Decision-making seemed to be firmly established in the headmaster.

All team members interviewed spoke of the high level of trust in the group and this was also evident in some of the course papers. However, there was a high degree of

distrust of the University in terms of the degree program, the credentializing process, the funding sources for the Program, and the course work. One team member in the interview kept repeating, "They're playing games with us."

Individual needs seemed to have been integrated with the goals and objectives of the school primarily because of the doctoral degree program which was stated as a strong motivating factor for team members. Contributing to this was the fact that individuals were chosen to join the team by the headmaster.

School D: A District High School

Descriptive Profile. School D is a district high school with 1143 students in grades nine through twelve. There are 65 staff members on the faculty. Prior to 1978, the school was housed in an old four story building complete with towers and turrets and situated on a hill overlooking the Boston neighborhood which it served. Since that time the school has been relocated to a more modern facility in the same area. The move to the new facility, the changing demographics of the community and the student population, the large staff turnover over the past three academic years, and perhaps most importantly, the assignment of three different headmasters in as many years, resulted in

great instability for the school, a polarization of the faculty, a student body characterized by disruptive behavior, and a negative image of the school in the community.

Information from Interviews. The new headmaster, like some of the other participating headmasters in the Program, had been associated with the University collaboration while on assignment at another school. At the first inservice session for the 1980-1981 school year, he announced the opportunity for joining the collaboration for the school and invited all those who were interested to meet with him. In addition, he also recruited specific faculty members to balance his team in terms of its racial and sex composition. The team began with a membership of nine teachers and administrators with the headmaster as team leader. Team meetings were held regularly after school one to three times a week for an average of two hours. Team members indicated in their interviews that these meetings often ran over. The team even met on a Saturday at one member's home.

Six interviews were conducted with these team members and one with a non-team member. Many stated the importance of having the headmaster as the team leader. He had been appointed to the position just months before the start of

the Program. He made it clear at the start of the school year that the school came first as a priority for him, even though he had previously been a doctoral candidate. He also shared his expectations of what he thought the school could become with his team members and this sharing of goals or expectations had a positive impact on the team members. Many of them commented in their interviews that they had "bought into his optimism." Another member said that "people on the team really put the school first."

In all the interviews, team meetings were described as "open, with lots of give and take," although when asked about conflict, some stated that open conflict was avoided. The composition of the team, with both teachers and administrators, was described as a new experience, very democratic and very positive.

There was no discussion of who would be the leader of the team. It was just assumed by some that it would be the headmaster. Others remarked that it was part of the Program design outlined by the University staff. One member said it was necessary that the headmaster be the leader due to past problems with leadership in the school. The leadership was characterized as democratic but "directed," members were expected to provide written reports to the leader. The team leader also provided time frames and gave feedback to members. As one member stated,

"The leader creates a tone of genuineness at meetings, he has high expectations, he talks ideas, not people. He encourages you to clarify, argue, convince him." Another said, "He is very open, pleasant, listens very well, he puts the school right up front and he told us that." When the headmaster could not attend meetings, the team lost direction even though many on the team stated that they were comfortable in assuming a leadership role. But due to the history of the school, it was apparent that team members wanted the headmaster to pull the team together. The support for him was particularly strong and extensive. One member said, "Working with the headmaster has been the most satisfying part of the team's work." Members also commented on the support they felt for one another in activities outside the work of the team: "I now have a nucleus I can depend on, the team is a resource." Another teacher stated that, "being part of the power structure, having the opportunity to be together with the headmaster" was the most satisfying aspect for her.

This intensive collaborative interaction had some negative implications for the faculty as a whole. Although the team expanded its membership in the Spring semester, the members expressed a sense of suspicion among some faculty that they were the 'headmaster's group," particularly among those in line positions in the hierarchy

of the school who are supposed to have legitimate access to him. Still, the sight of 12 or 15 people staying after school in the headmaster's conference room reportedly provoked the curiosity of many and may help to reverse the negative norm of most unionized schools in which the letter of the contract is held to the minute.

The Key Results Plan. The process of deciding on a Key Results Plan for the school was described by many interviewed as very painful. In addition to the brainstorming technique, the headmaster directed each member to defend their suggestions with reasons after reflecting over time and after listening to all arguments. After a few weeks, a consensus was finally reached. Many described the process as agonizing.

The overall goal was to improve teacher attitude, morale, and communication by focusing on the organizational policies of the school, creating policy where none existed, and making sure that the whole school community was clear on these policies so that consistency and fairness could be expected by all. After three different headmasters in three years and a very large staff turnover rate along with student turnover due to desegregation assignments, the Key Results Plan was designed to bring stability to the school.

As the team began work in the Fall of 1980, they identified the following organizational problems as "current conditions" in the school: inconsistency in the daily functioning of procedural matters affecting the atmosphere of the school; lack of any systems for faculty communication such as a teacher handbook; lack of faculty awareness of discipline procedures; and problems of commitment to any consistent policies or procedures. The team developed a questionnaire to test the hypothesis that poor morale was due in part to a lack of awareness on the part of the faculty. The findings of the questionnaire were shared with the entire staff. An orientation meeting was designed and implemented for the staff to clarify organizational procedures. Opportunities were made for all to have access to information to cope with the powerless situation expressed by many staff members in regard to the school.

The team also attempted to involve more staff members in the school in their Key Results Plan by developing task forces so that more would have the opportunity to be involved in the projects, to help find solutions, and to share in the sense of team spirit which was experienced by the team.

Evaluation of Key Results Plan by Peers. The evaluation team reported that they were very impressed with this particular school, that its climate seemed improved. This school team had produced eleven sub-Key Results Plans. Although the evaluation team remarked that this was extraordinarily ambitious, they also found that the team was handling this work. They commented that the solutions could be used at other schools which also faced the same myriad of problems.

A team non-participant at the school was interviewed and stated that he was aware of several procedural systems which had been set up by the team, complimenting them on taking action and not just discussing ideas. In his opinion, these systems would not have been implemented without the team because they had a "problem-solving focus."

Evaluation Data on the Teams and the University. The work of the teams on problems which involved improvements for the whole school was the most satisfying aspect for many interviewed. Others spoke of access to the power structure of the school and the increased support for the headmaster. The team used outside resources to help in solving problems. As the headmaster said, "the sharing is excellent" and this was obvious in many interviews: one member sought out all the course reading materials for the

team, another who had been an Organizational Development Specialist in private industry, brought in movies and other materials he had used. A unique feature of this team is the participation of the coordinator of the court-mandated college pairing on the team. She brought access to the resources of that college to the team including the development of a professional library for the school.

Team members commented extensively on the new skills, talents, and behavior patterns they discovered about one another. As one member said, "Teachers are very good at critical thinking, good articulators, and able to move groups to another stage. I have seen sides I hadn't seen before and have a new respect, a whole new approach to staff members." Another said, "I've certainly had a chance to see people's intellects in a way I hadn't seen before, an analytical ability . . . there's a warmth there too, cooperation." Though one member expressed that he felt some members did not succeed in dropping their occupational roles, most concurred with the headmaster who said that the team members' hidden talents had emerged in a way that no inservice session could have brought out.

Time constraints were a continuing frustration for team members who were also preparing the school for its evaluation for accreditation. The role of the University had been frustrating for some due to a lack of

communication while others raised the issue of institutional learning as a risk for some adults who had not been involved in course work for some time.

Summary Analysis Using Organizational Development Variables. It was evident in all the interviews that collaboration was a characteristic of this team, even beyond the actual team projects. One team member was interviewed while planning the final preparation for a Career Day which she was coordinating and two other team members were working with her after school to help her with the security plan. She explained that she knew she could count on their help because they were all on the U. Mass. team. The degree of sharing can be characterized as exemplary.

The reward system for this team was working with one another, working closely with the headmaster, and generally, participating in the power structure of the school. As one teacher said,

> . . . I have grown tremendously because of my participation. It has allowed me and encouraged me to assume leadership functions which I had not previously assumed - not within the team but within the school. The success of my program [with the business partner], its perception of success within the building have expanded what I'm doing and how I'm perceived and it has been very exciting . . . Participating with the team, I personally love working with these people.

> There is a personal satisfaction being part of what you feel as the power structure and it is. And there is a satisfaction in having the support and being fully comfortable with the headmaster. He and I have more opportunity to be together simply because of the team and that's also true of other members. It's just that I know these people better partly because of U. Mass.

Also rewarding were the new discoveries about the team members' talents, skills, and intellectual abilities.

Although several members commented that they felt comfortable assuming the role of leadership, they all clearly stated that the headmaster's role as leader was extremely important to them. It was apparent that there were many opportunities for people to try out new roles, especially the team process itself.

Decision-making appeared to have been a very participatory process. In addition, the headmaster stated that the team had bridged a major communications gap for him in terms of communicating decisions to the entire faculty and getting their feedback.

Trust appeared to be excellent among team members. As one member stated, "We do operate in a team fashion. There is definite trust, we talk to each other. And the major thing about this team model is that it gives a person a vehicle to bounce ideas off of, I'd say this is a very successful team."

At School D, all six team members interviewed expressed a strong commitment to work on improving their school. Personal growth through the degree program was ancillary to this main focus.

School E: A District High School

Descriptive Profile. School E, like School D, is also a district shcool which recently moved from a very old granite slab building to a brand new facility in the same neighborhood. It too has undergone changes in the last decade including a new headmaster, a change in the racial composition of the student and faculty populations, as well as a large faculty turnover. A faculty of 60 serves 800 students from grades nine through twelve.

Information From Interviews. School E was also similar to School D in terms of its past history in the collaboration with the University, for the headmaster was also involved in the degree program while assigned to another Boston school. When the University invited his school to participate in the team program he too announced the Program to all faculty members at the first inservice meeting in the Fall of 1980. A team of eight people joined the headmaster on the team. But by the end of the Fall

semester, only three remained. These three were interviewed in addition to the headmaster.

A unique feature of this team was the role of the headmaster. Although he led the initial meetings at the school, he acquiesced his role to one of the teacher members and, by the Spring semester, dropped out of participation in the Program entirely. The lack of his involvement with the team was detrimental to the successful implementation of their Key Results Plan. In addition, a number of team members dropped out at the end of the Fall semester, leaving only three members on the team. One of these members, described by both the headmaster and the other team members as bright, innovative and a born leader, took on the leadership of the team, although he did not accept the title comfortably.

The Key Results Plan. When the team began to deliberate on a problem to work on in the Fall, they used a technique of polling all members to see what people were interested in. Typically people stated problems in terms of their own area of responsibility. According to their Fall report, the process of developing a Key Results Plan helped them to change this direction and look at problems of the school as a whole. They decided on tardiness of students and did a 45 day study of the computerized attendance which showed

that between 66 and 72 students were tardy out of 536 attending school, or 13%. Of the total student population of 686 assigned to the school, 71% were tardy at least once in that 45 day period. Although the team attempted to look for causes first, they concluded that they were abstruse and not within their sphere of influence. They designed their Plan around a positive approach as well as an enforcement of a tardy policy, creating incentives for students who were on time. They made presentations to the faculty and received support. They even planned some community involvement in their Plan. However, even in their initial meetings, the headmaster did not participate in their discussion of choosing a problem, preferring as he said to see what the teachers came up with. By the time the team decided on the problem, there was very little communication between the team and the headmaster. Consequently, when their plan was presented to the headmaster, it was not implemented in the four step process planned out by the team. Instead, a tardy policy was enforced one day, retaining late students in a holding room, but the education prior to enforcement was not carried out. The tardy policy had no impact on changing student habits and perhaps made the situation worse by requiring them to sit in a holding room outside their class.

Evaluation of the Key Results Plan By Peers. There was no report given by the evaluation team assigned to School E.

Evaluation Data on the Team and the University. In their own progress report in the Spring, the team spoke of a sense of frustration and failure. They spoke of the low morale, not just at their school, but throughout the system, sensing a creeping ambivalence about doing anything in the Boston Public Schools. They spoke of having no power in the school, not being able to make decisions, and contrasted themselves with the team from School D, with eleven members and the active leadership and sustained support of the headmaster. They referred to their "magic plan" which had not been implemented the way they had planned, with no proper orientation for the students and faculty and with no inclusion of the positive inducements they had included. They concluded that they could not do anything more at their school to improve conditions unless they had more power. But they did continue on. They sought the help of a University consultant and drastically revised their Key Results Plan.

There was a great deal of respect for one another voiced by these team members and a certain pride even in their failure because they had at least attempted something. They made plans to recruit some administrators

to join them on the team the next year. Despite the lack of support from the headmaster, their dwindling numbers, the failure of their initial plan, they experienced satisfaction with the Program. As one member said, "To actually think we're working together, to actually solve a problem, as corny as that may sound, I feel good about that." Toward the end of the Spring semester, they began interacting socially with a similarly small team from another school and both teams expressed the support they derived from that interaction.

Summary Analysis Using Organizational Development Variables. Although the headmaster did not collaborate with the team, there was a spirit of working together among team members. In addition, this team reached out to work with another team during the Monday seminars. This interaction also functioned as a reward for members. As one said, "I've had rewarding experiences in terms of our team meeting with other teams, learning that we have similar problems and obstacles to overcome . . . You know, somtimes you think, is it worthwhile and you get very frustrated and then you see other people who are still in there pitching."

In addition to the rewarding aspects of this collaboration and interaction, team members expressed a

sense of reward simply because they were working on a problem that might benefit the whole school.

Leadership for the team was provided by one teacher member. His authority was termed as natural, and based on his talents and not his role. A sharing of resources was also apparent, particularly in the videotape presentation given during the mini-sabbatical in Amherst.

Conflict resolution was not apparent on this team, probably due to the small size and the willingness to accept the direction of the team leader. The problem of student tardiness had been originally suggested by him.

Trust was also evident among the three remaining team members who, despite their smaller size and lack of headmaster involvement, and the initial failure of their Key Results Plan, continued to work together and who expressed a closeness among them.

The fact that this team chose a school-wide objective early in the Fall and relinquished their own particular concerns would indicate a commitment to organizational objectives. Increased self-direction was also apparent in their new Key Results Plan and in their endeavor to increase the size of their team. Instead of treating the symptom of tardiness, they are beginning to look at deeper issues in terms of the culture of the school.

School F: The Exam School

Descriptive Profile. School F is one of the exam schools of the Boston School System, which means that entering students must pass a qualifying exam in order to be admitted. The school serves a population of 1155 students from grades seven through twelve and has a faculty of 65. As stated in the team's Fall report, it is one of the oldest schools in the Boston School System. Like other schools in Boston, it has become a school in transition over the last ten years. Initially an all-female school (the teachers' rooms are still segregated by sex), the law which brought the admission of boys, the federal desegregation order, and the changing demography of the city have all had a tremendous effect on the school.

Information From Interviews. For this school, the collaboration with the University during the school year of this study marked the first involvement with an outside agency in the school's 150 year old history. The headmaster introduced the team program to the entire faculty and, like many of the other headmasters in the program, had originally participated in the degree program while working at another school in the system. Although about twenty faculty members showed some interest, the team

which formed in the Fall of 1980 consisted of four members with the headmaster functioning as the team leader. The team eventually dwindled to a membership of three due to illness on the part of one member and lack of interest on the part of another. The team of three met very frequently during the week, setting aside planning time during the school day, and sometimes meeting both before and after school.

The Key Results Plan. When they initially began to discuss a problem for their Key Results Plan, they wanted to work on everything, as one member said. In the Fall report, they identified several indicators of a negative school climate including a lack of cohesiveness on the faculty as a whole, low staff morale, and a lack of identity with the school as a whole. They indicated that both vandalism and graffiti had increased markedly at the school and connected these increases to a failure on the part of the staff to perceive the needs of the student population. Statistics also revealed an increase in the number of student failures and in the number of students dropping out of the school, even in their senior year. They reached a consensus that these issues were the problems to address in their Key Results Plan. Their report also recognized the increasing symptoms of teacher burnout on the faculty which manifested

in a victim-blaming mentality regarding student failures and a lack of sensitivity to the needs of a changing school population. Lack of adjustment increased teacher isolation as they would spend the whole day within their own classrooms. There was no socializing among teachers and barely a nod of acknowledgement to one another in passing. Therefore, part of the Key Results Plan was a focus on the needs of the faculty through some after-school workshops on teacher burnout and coping with stress, as well as some sensitivity training in meeting the needs of the student population.

Meetings were characterized as extremely democratic and open, with a great deal of information sharing and what members characterized as a sense of mutual respect.

Although team members assumed that the headmaster was the team leader, a democratic style characterized his leadership. Members said they worked by consensus and that their meetings were almost leaderless, except at the Monday seminars.

Data collected indicated that the culture of the school was staunchly grounded on individual classroom teaching. Having the headmaster meet with a team of teachers in his conference room after school often aroused distrust and even hostility from some faculty members. When the team made a presentation to the Faculty Senate, reaction was

negative and non-supportive (one member of the Senate left the room in the middle of the presentation) but the team continued to devise strategies to get the faculty involved in examining some critical issues regarding the school. In their interviews, team members expressed a commitment to long range planning to improve the school. They were very conscious of the need to fill the gap between the team and the rest of the faculty in order for the Key Results Plan to succeed for the benefit of the faculty and students alike.

Evaluation of the Key Results Plan by Peers. The evaluation team reported that they found the team at School F frustrated in regard to their lack of accomplishment in achieving their Key Results Plan. They cited a lack of cooperation on the part of other faculty members as one reason. The school team had made up a questionnaire to give out to the faculty to determine their sensitivity to the problems of student failure. It was rejected when presented to the Faculty Senate which told the team that it didn't apply to them. The school team took a different tactic after that rebuff, speaking individually to teachers and planning strategies to increase the size of the team for next year. As one evaluation team member said, "I wish I had a trophy for the amount of effort put forth by this team in spite of their frustrations."

Evaluation Data on the Teams and the University. In their Spring progress report, the team stated that they were having negative results in terms of building a support system in the school for their Key Results Plan, neutral results in terms of making the faculty aware of students' needs in regard to an orientation to the school, and positive results in regard to increased parent support for the school. The effects of the team involvement for the school thus far can be seen in the increased awareness on the part of the teachers involved on the teams. For example, one teacher reported that she had begun sharing her course goals with her students and was beginning to include them in making decisions as a result of her work on the team. Also, as the headmaster said, the issues had been raised and the potential was there for some enlightenment.

As far as the team itself was concerned, the headmaster was very impressed with the new interaction among members that he observed ouside of team activities. He gave one example in his interview.

> . . . It made me feel good - when we had five members, one of the members was a Black female and she expressed a different viewpoint because she was a Physical Educator and the other team members were in Academics - when she said, "You know, I never talked to the white female teacher ever before, we never had anything to talk about, and now, because of this [team], we talk all the time

> and we understand each other better." So if nothing else has come out of this whole project, one more faculty member was talking to one more faculty member and they finally found out they had things of mutual interest and mutual concern.

Team members divided up aspects of their Key Results Plan based on their own strategies and there was evidence of a good deal of sharing. New patterns of interaction were experienced: "Prior to this, I knew who the other team member was like I know a lot of teachers," said one member, "but I don't really talk to them that much, sort of in passing. But now I have come to know the other member a lot more, problems with her family, that sort of thing." For another member who had recently lost a bid for a promotion, the team was a vehicle to exercise some leadership and try to implement some ideas. And for the headmaster, the team was a method to help him address some important issues for the school. One member said it was "the first time I got my hands on a problem internal to the whole building, not something I was just teaching, to have some input, using your talents and skills as an educator to try to change something that isn't quite right. And whether we succeeded or not, at least it was a shot in that direction. That was satisfying, that's what I really got out of this, you're having an impact on any kind of improvement or informed change, it's got to be

worthwhile." For this team member, the most frustrating aspect of the team course was the lack of enthusiasm and participation by his colleagues at the school:

> . . . It's just surprising, especially in this school of this caliber, that they would be that way . . . I think it's the attitude of the staff itself. And I don't know how common it is throughout the city, obviously in some schools it's not. When you go to those Monday meetings and some of those schools have tremendous representation . . . If our faculty could see what they are neglecting, what could be done, [but] all they see is, this attitude of "I'll go hide in my classroom and close the door behind me, I'll just teach." It's not enough, you've got to think of something bigger than that. That's great, it makes good teachers but it doesn't make good schools. That's the problem.

Summary Analysis Using Organizational Development Variables. Collaboration was a hallmark of this small team. They divided work on the basis of their capabilities and interests and expressed new respect for each others' talents as they were demonstrated in their work together.

The reward system seemed to have been the work on the team itself, a chance to implement ideas which they had incubated individually and a new level of sharing and interacting.

Although the headmaster functioned as the team leader, communication flowed both ways without regard to a hierarchy. They built on each other's experiences and took advantage of viewing problems from different vantage

points. The headmaster stated that he saw no need to reinforce his role as headmaster while on the team.

It was evident from the interviews that the initial discussions of problems were conducted in an open climate. This sharing atmosphere intensified when only three team members remained for the Spring semester. The group became a mutual support group, particularly for the headmaster who welcomed more critical responses to his ideas.

Trust was strongly evident on this team. Members as well as the headmaster said that they shared a great deal of information about the school, felt they could openly express viewpoints without any repercussions, and were sure that confidentiality would be maintained.

An analysis of the data indicates that School F was successful in integrating individual needs for growth and development with the needs of the school. As the headmaster said,

> . . . The idea of working together, teachers and administrators, on some project of mutual interest, of mutual benefit to individuals and more importantly, to the school . . . the idea that people can work together, especially the idea that administrators and classroom teachers can jointly plan some activities and then work together to carry them out and bring them to completion, I think is an excellent one."

And a team member expressed the sense of integration this way:

> . . . In my 13 years in Boston, very rarely was I given the opportunity to meet with staff from other schools . . . I find the U. Mass program a much more practical and concrete course than other educational courses. My work in class is practical, I can apply it to the school. This is the prime reason why I wish to be in the U. Mass program for my doctorate. While taking these courses I can practically apply my knowledge to bring about positive changes in my school.

School G: The Campus Magnet High School

Descriptive Profile. School G opened in 1975 and was the newest four year high school in the city. The year it opened coincided with Phase II of the federal court order for the desegration of Boston's schools and part of the order designated the new school as the city-wide magnet school, along with several other schools already a part of the system. The school was built on a large, ten acre campus with five separate buildings. Approximately 150 faculty and support staff serve a student population of 2200 in grades nine through twelve. As a newly established organization, teachers from many schools in the city volunteered to transfer to the school, attracted to the opportunity to develop new curriculum ideas and to the possibility of having an influence in creating a new school organization. During the first five years of operation, the school developed a reputation for its innovative programs and policies.

Information From Interviews. School G had been associated with the University collaboration prior to the team program. Some faculty members had participated in course work at another school which was working with the University and a few were enrolled in degree programs. But when the team program began in the Fall of 1980, the school was in transition due to a change in leadership. The headmaster was assigned to another school and several other administrators were transferred to other schools or given different job descriptions. The newly assigned headmaster did not participate in the University team program. There were to have been two teams from the school, one led by the headmaster and the other by an assistant headmaster but the personnel shifts brought the number of participants down to six and therefore, only one team was formed.

The Key Results Plan. In the Fall semester the team produced a Key Results Plan which aimed at improving the educational climate of the school. The plan consisted of components that were to have been developed by each team member, based on their area of expertise. As the Fall report from the team indicated, the team did not reach a consensus on their Key Results Plan as some of the other teams had. Rather, they chose to develop individual key results which would be incorporated into an "umbrella"

statement regarding interrelated variables chosen because of their potential for having an impact on the school climate. These variables included: curriculum development by interdisciplinary teams of teachers; an effective program of mainstreaming special needs students; increased parental involvement in the school; and improved staff effectiveness through the use of efficiency studies and management techniques adapted from private enterprise.

The curriculum problem addressed the issue of the organization of the secondary school. As one member wrote in the Fall report, "At the secondary level, there is a kind of curriculum isolationism that can be a barrier among teachers that can have an effect on the learning processes of the students. Research cited by the Ford Foundation showed writing as being a practice needed to develop better thinking skills as well as reading skills. The interrelatedness of the three was the essential finding." This part of the team paper therefore proposed a cross-section of teachers from various subject areas to form committees to develop curriculum reinforcing the three skills.

The Key Results Plan for mainstreaming special needs students was to be implemented in several steps: getting a commitment from the department head of special needs; discussion with other special needs teachers and

introduction of the Key Results Plan; hiring tutors to assist students in mainstreamed classes; weekly meetings with regular classroom teachers about the mainstreamed students; and use of a new Mainstreaming Teacher Training Program recently established by Simmons College.

The action plan for parent involvement was equally detailed and centered around the development of a broad based communication system between the school and parents. Many of the planned activities were designed to involve parents in positive experiences with the school, rather than the usual parental conference for behavioral or academic problems.

At the end of the Fall semester, the entire Key Results Plan was submitted to the headmaster but it did not receive his support.

As the Spring semester began, the leadership of the team changed since the former leader resigned to do Independent Study. Two of the six members continued and one accepted the team leader role at the request of the former leader. She recruited a new team in the Spring, but purposely did not open membership to the entire faculty, explaining that she felt there was a need for a commitment for the team's work, not just joining for the sake of graduate credits. Although she was not chosen by the team, all team members interviewed described her leadership style

in positive terms. Her role was seen clearly as getting the team together on their tasks but as one member explained, the leadership at meetings was a shared responsibility. The climate of the meetings was characterized as democratic, supportive and dynamic.

Six interviews were conducted with members from both teams, in addition to an interview with the headmaster. The Spring team dropped the Key Results Plan because they wanted to work on one problem together and because they wanted to get the acceptance of the headmaster. The team struggled over the complexity of the school and its multiple problems, requiring long discussions. With advice from one of the University facilitators, the team decided to choose the issue of communication in the school.

They came up with the idea of a group which would be a problem-solving forum which would come together to discuss the issues, not really air complaints but try to discuss solutions or barriers to solutions so that faculty members would at least know that issues were not being ignored. The strategy was to apply the problem-solving team approach they had learned in the course to the whole school. The team progress report indicated that they had met with the headmaster and he had agreed to attend the forums. At the time of the report, they had already had one such forum after school. However, the headmaster did not attend. He

later stated in his interview that the plan did not impress him. Perhaps his lack of participation in the developmental stages of this plan kept him from understanding the role the team wanted to play in the forum. He wanted them to become a decision-making body and also to implement decisions and evaluate solutions whereas the team saw their role in a more advisory capacity.

Faculty response to the plan was positive but his team was also rebuffed by their Faculty Senate. The cohesiveness of this team increased as a result and could be seen clearly in the videotape produced for the mini-sabbatical.

Evaluation of Key Results Plan by Peers. The evaluation team sent to School G stated that it was difficult to measure the effects of the Key Results Plan because it had been a difficult year for both the team and the school as a whole. Although two forums had been held prior to the evaluation, it was too early to tell if the team project had helped the school. The evaluation team did state that the team had developed a realistic approach in finding a way in which to give small groups a greater amount of power by bringing them together and had therefore done a service to the school. They had also set up a stress workshop with Professor Al Alschuler from the School of Education of the University of Massachusetts for the school.

Evaluation Data on the Team and the University. For the school as a whole, evidence shows that the impact of the team was minimal, but for the team members, it was rewarding. The team members expressed a desire to set up another forum next year whether they were involved in the team course or not.

The team did not use outside resources to a great extent because, as one member said, "We think the solution is inside the building." All but one member found the team model satisfying because, as one said, "You're the solution, you don't have someone dictating what you should do."

Summary Analysis Using Organizational Development Variables. Collaboration was maximized in the group. They reported sharing leadership responsibility and applying their diverse talents and backgrounds in order to give the team new perspectives. Several team members described a sense of reward simply through working together, empowering them as a team even if they did not have a wide success in the school as a whole.

Team members expressed an increased sense of power of awareness in terms of self-direction and control over school problems due to the team experience:

> . . . I really think a lot of inservice is sort of the treasure chest idea of educational knowledge that somebody will come into the school and give you the treasure. It doesn't work like that because there's so much that really has to do with process and the whole business with the teams is positive relationships and coalitions among schools and there's something non-threatening about the whole situation. You're not being told what you're going to have to do, not having the solutions imposed on you. You're the solution.

Even without the headmaster on the team, there were members of the administrative hierarchy on the team but they succeeded in dropping their authority roles in favor of a more democratic process. As one member said, "The roles did drop away as our identity as a group became more defined and our roles in the school became less important to the functioning of the group."

Several members of this team elaborated on the process they used for developing a Key Results Plan and their descriptions clearly identify this as the process of consensus. Team members stated that their meetings were characterized by an open, problem-solving climate and in one such meeting observed, this was clearly so.

There was evidence in several interviews that this team had developed a high degree of trust and cohesion. The incident of their presentation to the school's Faculty Senate illustrates these characteristics because one of the

team members was also on the Faculty Senate and he dropped out of the Senate after their rejection of the forum idea.

Several team members interviewed expressed that the integration of their own needs for professional growth and the needs of the school had occurred through the team process. One said she joined for the credit but also because she liked the problem-solving approach for the school. Another brought up the political and economic context within which the Program was operating in Boston:

> . . . I personally like the involvement with the team, particularly this year, a lot of things are going on at this school and the city. There's a lack of momentum and impetus everywhere and a group like this brings together people who are trying to solve problems and make suggestions and it has a lot of positive results, it's constructive. The thing that's nice about it is it's related to U. Mass., it's a course that somehow what you're doing is very closely related or connected to what you want to do for the school. I think it's really crucial for people to somehow feel it's really worth doing as opposed to simply getting credits. It's very special. It's nice if you can get credit for making something better in the school as opposed to going off and doing something that is really isolated and doesn't have an impact.

Questionnaire Data

Introduction. As stated in Chapter IV, Methodology, a questionnaire was designed to collect information from the participants in three general areas of their experiences

with the Program and generalize on their perceptions regarding these areas. The questions were designed to verify perceptions regarding team participation which had been expressed in the interviews. The three areas were: participant perceptions of the team design and what effect it had had on personal goals, school goals, to what extent it fostered interdependence among the participants and if it contributed to communication and other attributes of team building. The second set of questions pertained to the processes of team meetings as perceived by the participants. The third section of the questionnaire was composed of open-ended questions concerning people's observations of what they had liked best and least about the program and what changes they would make for the next year to improve it. In addition, team members were asked to respond to a separate section designed to collect their perceptions of the leadership of their team, since this was an important variable under the study.

The questionnaire also asked for information regarding the educational backgrounds of the participants to develop a profile of Program participants. Since the questionnaires were anonymous due to the sensitive nature of some of the questions, the data cannot be analyzed on the basis of individual school teams. The results are primarily presented to support the validity and reliability

of the findings summarized from the interviews and from the participant observations of the teams during their first year of operation. A copy of the complete questionnaire can be found in Appendix F.

Questionnaire Results. Nine statements regarding the perceived impact of the work of the teams were presented. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with these statements using the Likert scale. In terms of integrating individual needs for growth with school needs, 78% responded positively and 61% agreed that the work on the teams had had a positive impact on their work at school. Participation on the teams was perceived as being equal by 62% and 64% agreed that the team design gave them more access to other administrators and teachers on their staffs. Eighty-three percent stated they could depend on team members for support and 76% agreed that being on the team had helped them to communicate more with others. The goals of the team were clear to 88% of the respondents and 84% agreed they had new insights into school issues as a result of their team involvement. However, 59% were undecided about whether or not the work of the team had improved conditions in the schools, although 32% thought that it had.

In response to questions regarding team meetings, respondents generally agreed that there was ample opportunity for discussion prior to making decisions on the team, verifying the interview response to the question of consensus on teams. Ninety-five percent perceived that people listened to one another at meetings, but some agreed that some do more of the talking than others (89%). Contrary to the information from the interviews regarding conflict on the teams, 82% reported that differences of opinion were discussed openly at meetings, which may indicate the negative connotation that people have of the word, "conflict." In the interviews, when the question was rephrased from "conflict" to "differences of opinion," more people admitted that differences were aired on some teams.

Open-Ended Question Results. "What are some of the things you liked best about the team?"

There were five general themes which were repeated throughout the questionnaires returned. The majority stated that interaction, both socially and intellectually among colleagues in the school, among other school faculties, and with the University faculty was what they liked best. Some stated that support for one another, support for the headmaster, and support for the school as a whole were positive experiences for them. Increased

opportunities for communicating between school members working in different departments in the same school and with students was brought up by some. Others stated that the chance to work on real school issues and a sharing of resources in addressing mutual concerns were listed by several respondents.

"What do you like least about the teams?"

A majority responded that time constraints were the biggest problems they had experienced. Related to this problem was the lack of opportunity for meeting on teams during the Monday sessions. The frustration of trying to expand school membership on the team was also brought out, as well as the frustration over the lack of administrative support experienced by some school teams and the lack of enthusiasm regarding the team's work for the schools. And many people stated their frustration regarding the question of success for the teams in trying to make an impact on improving the schools.

"What changes would you make in this team approach to school problem-solving?"

Most team members stated that enlarging the size of the teams was the most important change to make. In addition, participants wanted more time for teams to meet on Mondays and more interaction with the faculty from the University. Some wanted to see more structure to the Program.

"What needs to happen to make your teams more effective?"

More participation by school members was again seen as a needed improvement, or at least more communication with non-team members at the school as to the goals of the teams.

Participant Profiles. There were several questions which were designed to collect data on the educational backgrounds of the Program participants and their attitudes toward their work in the schools and how they perceived the purpose of the team for their school. The majority (29 or 76%) of the participants have worked as teachers or administrators from 5 to 15 years. Only 2 or 5% had served for less than five years. In terms of education, 26 or 70% had already earned a Master's degree and 11 or 30% had already earned 45 credits beyond a Master's. The majority (27 or 73%) had not participated in the University Program before this year, but only 17 or 46% had participated for the whole school year.

In choosing a description which characterized their teams, 29 or 76% chose "problem-solving group" and 23 or 60% chose "support group" as a descriptor. Although 17 or 45% saw the team as "an advisory committee for the headmaster," only 11 or 29% identified the team as "a leadership team for the school."

When asked to choose among five categories for their work at school, 36 or 92% chose either "career" or "a vocation," whereas only one person chose "a job."[1]

The profiles characterizing the majority of the participants in the program (54% return from all participants) indicate a group with little need for further graduate credits and credentials for their positions, a mature group in terms of experience in the schools, and a commitment to their work in the schools as something beyond just a job. It is significant to note that the teams are seen as advisory or helping bodies rather than as leadership groups for the schools, indicating a reluctance to assume this kind of power which was brought out in several interviews. This concept of the empowering ability of the team design and the necessity to help people understand the dynamics of power is an important finding for Program designers and will be discussed more fully in Chapter VII, Summary and Recommendations.

Leadership Data. Data on the perception of leadership of the teams were collected from teachers or team members only. Three areas of leadership on the teams were studied: team member perceptions of their relationship with their headmasters; team member perceptions of the type of leadership style of their headmaster or team leader,

especially at team meetings; and team members perceptions of the leadership style of their headmaster in general.

Thirty-four people responded to these leadership questions and of this number, 17 indicated that their headmaster was also their team leader. These respondents described their relationship with their headmaster as primarily a "colleague" or a "helper" while only four saw it as a "boss to a subordinate."

In team meetings, team members generally perceived positive interactions with their headmasters, agreeing that his ideas are questioned by team members and that new ideas were shared with the group and involving all members in team discussions and giving clear directions. Most stated the leadership style was best characterized as "democratic" but three responded that the leadership style on their team was "laissez-faire." No one saw their headmaster's leadership as "authoritarian" and one respondent added his/her own category as "leadership among professionals."

For the team leaders who were not also headmasters, there were similar responses, describing their relationship as either "colleague" or "friend." It is interesting to note that in this group no one chose "helper" whereas the group working with their headmasters as team leaders chose this characterization 6 times. This may be due to the perception on the part of team members that the problems in

the school belong to the headmaster and they are helping him to solve them.

Footnotes

[1]See Stec, Staff Development.

[2]See LeGendre, Case Study.

C H A P T E R V I

The Conclusions

Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation study is to determine what factors have a positive impact on the development of effective teams in schools and what conditions prevent teams from functioning effectively. Effective teams are not judged so much by their outcomes for school improvement during the first year of operation as much as they are by the processes that characterize their operation. As the research on intervention strategies by the Rand Corporation has shown, it takes an average of five years for an intervention project to be fully implemented in a school. Since the teams in this study were in the first year of operation, evaluating their impact on improving the schools should be the purpose of a more long-range study. Therefore, for the purpose of this study, the effectiveness of a school team is measured by the characteristics formulated by Rensis Likert from the cumulative research he has reviewed on effective groups as outlined in Chapter IV: Methodology.

In order to study the teams during their first year of operation in the schools, data were collected from several sources including:

1. Forty-four interviews with team members, non-team members from participating schools, all headmasters from the participating schools, all team leaders, University facilitators, and a consultant to the Program;

2. The Key Results Plan of the teams;

3. Participant course papers for the Fall and Spring semesters;

4. Spring course progress reports made by the teams;

5. Spring course evaluation reports made by teams of one another;

6. Participant observations made of team classes and meetings;

7. Questionnaire returns from team participants.

After analysis of the above data and a review of the literature, I conclude that five factors or sets of conditions are necessary for the effective functioning of school teams. These five factors are not presented in the order of importance. Indeed, research findings and the data under analysis indicate that all five factors interact with one another in both obvious and subtle ways:

1. The organizational structure of the school and local autonomy of the school.

2. Leadership both of the teams and of the school.

3. Composition of the teams and the sharing of resources.

4. Team norms for communication and interaction.

5. Goals or purpose of the teams for individuals, for the school, and for the Program.

Clarification of the Conclusions

#1 The Organizational Structure of the School. The school as an organization must be "ready" to accept a team concept. There must be the beginning of an open atmosphere in which teachers and administrators are willing to acknowledge that there are problems in the school which can be admitted, articulated in a non-threatening way, and addressed with the intention of solving them and not just discussing them. There must be a sense that the school can act somewhat autonomously as an organization apart from the larger school system to address at least some school problems. In other words, the school must have a sense of power over some areas in which there are problems. In School B, for example, which started out with two teams in the Fall, one team dropped its Key Results Plan entirely after one semester. For although the team had chosen a chronic and difficult problem for the school, student absenteeism, it was soon recognized by team members that they would be powerless to have any sustained, positive impact on this problem unless there was a major policy change from central administration. And School D, which made great progress during the year of this study, chose to work on in-house organizational systems which could be developed and implemented without any outside intervention even from the district superintendent's office. Therefore,

the school must have a sense of power and control over the agendas they chose.

#2 Leadership. The factor of leadership is interlocked with the organizational structure of the school, for the leader's style can set the patterns of how people function individually and collectively in the life of the organization. It is obvious but very necessary to point out that leadership of the team and of the school in which the team is operating is of paramount importance to the effective functioning of the team.

The style of the leader of the school must be characterized by an ability to collaborate with subordinates in a way that communicates to them a confidence in their ability to make a contribution to improving the school. Direct participation of the headmaster on the team is not as important as the perception he or she gives to the team of the value of their contribution. For example, at School D, the headmaster functioned as team leader and set the tone for the team by communicating the importance of the team work for the school above his own agenda in the degree program. At School A where the headmaster did not participate in the team, he was able to communicate his support for their work by sharing agendas with them and delegating tasks to them that were important to the goals of the school, what he characterized as a periodic "shot in the arm." But for one of the teams at School B, which did

not interact with the headmaster and which ceased functioning as a team after one semester, the lack of some message of inspiration from the headmaster was brought up by a team member in her interview: "He could have inspired us. Probably at the time when you need someone to pull you together and there's no one there, you don't realize it until it's over."

Although direct participation of the headmaster on the team is not crucial to the effectiveness of the team, periodic interaction is necessary in both the planning and implementation stages. The headmaster must make a time commitment to interact periodically with the team. In two schools, the paucity of the headmasters' interaction with the teams contributed to the failure of their Key Results Plans. At School E, for example, the headmaster dropped out of the Program and did not understand the many steps developed by the team to implement their plan. Even though the headmaster cooperated with them in supporting their idea, he implemented the plan in only one aspect because he was not aware of the rationale the team had developed to make their plan work. And at School G, where the headmaster again supported the team but did not interact with them, the forum which they had designed to improve communication between the administration and the teachers had a minimal effect on the school because the headmaster did not support the forum when it was implemented.

If the team is led by a teacher or other administrator in the school, the communication link between the team leader and the headmaster must be frequently used and should be visible to members of the organization, particularly members of the team. For example, the team from School A had two team leaders who had frequent meetings with the headmaster. In addition, he used memoranda to reiterate the subjects under discussion with the entire team so that everyone who was interviewed expressed a confidence in their headmaster and his support of their work. But at School G, the team as a whole met only twice during the Spring semester with the headmaster, the team leader did not meet with him to give him an update on the progress of the team, nor did he communicate any agenda to them. Consequently he reported in his interview at the end of the school year that he was not aware of what the team was doing at all.

If the headmaster does not lead the team, then the process of choosing a leader becomes important for the team. In School B, which had two teams in the Fall semester, one of the teams was not led by the headmaster. Team members chose one teacher at a meeting in which many team members were not present. This leader was not accepted by all members, nor did she participate in the Fall mini-sabbatical. She dropped out of the program at

the end of the Fall semester. And on the other team at the same school, team members reported that by the Spring, two of them were taking turns chairing meetings. These team meetings were only used for getting tasks assigned and there was evidence of very little commitment to the team and its Key Results Plan beyond that school year, even though the problem chosen would continue to be a real problem for students and the school's curriculum plan and master schedule for years to come.

If the headmaster's style is characterized by an openness to innovation and change, then the team can derive more satisfaction and perceive more power if he or she is participating on the team. As small as the team from School F was with only two teachers and the headmaster as leader, data from several sources indicated a sense of long-term commitment, a trust among team members, a perception of success even though measureable outcomes at the school were almost non-existent. And at School D, team members expressed great respect for the ability of the headmaster as team leader to not only listen to all sides of a discussion, but also to push people to articulate their opinions and defend their arguments. There was a sense conveyed in their interviews that they all had the power to make things happen for the school and they were proud of their association with the headmaster on the

team. This spirit was not apparent among members from School C where the headmaster as team leader had chosen which teachers would be on his team. Although they indicated that they enjoyed the weekly team meetings, their plan for the school year remained generalized and too vague to be implemented.

In terms of the classic styles of leadership, that is, democratic, laissez-faire, and autocratic, team leaders who were either democratic or autocratic had more effective teams than those characterized as laissez-faire. Even in the democratic style, which characterized several schools, was not as effective as what one teacher described as the "directed democratic" style of the headmaster as team leader at School D because the leader used democratic techniques but also made demands of team members by setting up tasks, timelines, and requests for reports. Schools in which the headmasters had a laissez-faire approach to the work of the teams left members feeling confused, frustrated, and even bitter about the Program.

#3 Composition of the teams and Sharing of Resources. It is important that the teams be composed of members who are classroom teachers and members who function in an administrative capacity such as headmasters, assistant headmasters, or department chairpersons. More viewpoints

can make a richer contribution to the problems of the school and more constituencies in the school organization will have more of a sense of ownership of decisions made and plans implemented. A team in such a combination releases a pool of resources for the headmaster and can provide a support group for administrative decisions. It can also give the administrators a more direct link with the realities of the classroom and can help them to influence what goes on in those classrooms. In the true sense of teaming, this combination can help a school rise above the typical scenario of fingerpointing and blaming that has developed between teachers and administrators for so many years. Research has confirmed the importance of the role of the principal in any successful change effort in the school, but principals cannot do the job alone, especially in the setting of urban schools and the complexities of the problems they must face. It would be even more effective if teams could also include some parents and students and perhaps some community representatives so that all parts of the school community could participate in school improvement plans. This synergy could unleash a great deal of energy which could have a powerful impact on the school.

If the headmaster is not on the team in any capacity, then it is important that a person in a line position with

direct access to him or her be on the team. On School Team A, for example, the headmaster was not on the team. However, the administrator directly below him in rank on the schools' organizational chart was a team member. The team therefore had confidence that they would have no problem at the implementation stages of their plan because the administrator could represent their entire plan to the headmaster. And again at School G, although the headmaster had no participation with the team, there were several department heads on the team who took the responsibility to delineate the team's plan to him. Their plan was implemented according to their design. However, at School E, when the headmaster dropped out of the Program at the end of the Fall semester, leaving three classroom teachers on the team, the attempt to implement the plan failed. At least one reason for the failure was the incorrect implementation of the plan by the administration. The small size of this team was not as detrimental to its functioning as the lack of any administrative viewpoint, understanding, and support for the team. At a school with a team of the same size, School F, the participation by the headmaster contributed to the success of that school plan. Therefore, it is important to have school teams composed of both teachers and administrators. Each group must understand the different perspectives for it is also

typical of the secondary school organization that both groups spend their work days functioning very differently. Administrators are continually criticized for forgetting the perspective of the classroom teacher and, likewise, the classroom teacher, isolated for five periods a day within a classroom, does not have the opportunity for looking at issues, policies, and plans from a more generalized perspective. In addition, the supervisory relationship contributes to the misunderstanding of the role perspectives and adversarial nature of the relationship between these groups, turning some schools into armed camps, or in Blumberg's analogy a "cold war." There was a great deal of evidence expressed from many administrators and teachers concerning new insights and new respect for one anothers' contributions and differing perspectives and how the teams used these differences to develop plans for the schools. Evidence from both the interviews and questionnaires showed how the teams with membership from both teachers and administrators helped to foster a new spirit of colleagueship between these two groups.

In addition to having teams composed of both teachers and administrators, some of the larger schools can benefit by a cross-representation of other members of the school organization, for example, guidance counselors and housemasters who generally function as deans of

discipline. School D, for example, had the most diverse membership of any of the school teams including the headmaster, assistant headmasters, housemasters, teachers and even the coordinator of their college-paired program. The diversity of viewpoints contributed to the success of their program for their Key Results Plan was practical, specialized, delegative, and well thought out. In contrast, School A, an even larger organization, had a team composed of members from the same department in the school with the exception of one classroom teacher. Their plan was a five year plan which needed a lot more work for any short-term gains and there was a certain burden put on the one classroom teacher to argue from the position of the classroom teacher. In fact, she was often left out of meetings because of her teaching schedule.

The recruitment method for the team is another important consideration. It is important that all members of the faculty have access to membership, although for reasons apparent in the political climate of the school, open recruitment may not be a positive step for a headmaster, particularly a new headmaster entering a school where his precursor had developed a strong constituency. Nevertheless, it is important that the rest of the faculty have access so that the team does not project an elitist image which could lead eventually to sabotage of their team

plan by non-members. The very nature of the team model which requires attention to school-wide issues and a large time commitment procludes the enrollment of those who do not like to relate as a "team" or who do not consider problems outside their classrooms as being within their purview. Not only is headmaster group elitism an issue, there is the added access to the degree program for all team participants which increases the sensitivity of the recruitment issue. At the end of this study, the University reinstituted a series of more traditional courses to be offered the following year for all participating schools in order to provide non-team players with the opportunity to study for degrees and credit. Another sensitive issue is the perception of the headmaster's power to allow some faculty members access to advanced degrees and to close out others. On the one hand, this does give the headmaster control over a reward or incentive system that otherwise is non-existent in the structure of the Boston schools. But on the other hand, it may cause the team members to become preoccupied with the degree program and diminish healthy debate on the teams by arousing fears of being dropped out of participation if one falls out of favor with the headmaster.

In addition, given the history of inequality of opportunity and power for women and minorities in the

Boston School System, it is also important that the headmaster/team leader recruit representatives of all races working in their particular school and that there be a proportional number of both men and women on their teams. Not only are these varied perspectives valuable on teams, their membership can be another opportunity for visibility, access to power and resources traditionally denied these groups. School D, which achieved a great deal of success in both the design and implementation of its Key Results Plan, demonstrated how a representative team must be constructed consciously. When the team course was first announced to the whole faculty, very few Black faculty members applied initially. Realizing this after the first meeting, the headmaster personally recruited more Blacks. Each team member made a significant contribution to the team. At School G, the team leader could not recruit women teachers to join the team because, she explained, they felt disenfranchised at the school and could not see making a contribution which from past experience would go unrecognized. At School B, there was initially a good mixture of men and women on the teams but by second semester, no women were left. One woman who was interviewed explained that she did not feel a part of the headmaster's network, though there is no evidence of how the lack of women on the remaining team affected their results.

The size of the teams is another important variable for schools to consider. A range of five to ten is the most effective number range for people engaged in intense collaboration such as the teams demonstrate. Although a team by definition can be composed of two, as in "team of oxen," two or three people cannot take advantage of a diversity of viewpoints and cannot represent a critical mass at the schools large enough for a noticeable impact. At School F when the team lost two members and was three in number, the headmaster commented that he had lost the opportunity to hear some constructive feedback on his ideas, that the remaining two echoed his ideas. On the other hand, when the team from School D grew from nine to over twelve in the Spring, they lost a number of the new members after the first meeting because there were too many for forming a discussion circle and many had to sit removed from the group. Decision-making groups cannot get too large or consensus becomes virtually impossible and research has shown that there is a tendency for coalitions to form in larger groups. Another variable related to the size of the team is the number of teams any one school should have at the same time. If a school has more than one team, then leadership for each team must be provided. Also, cross-communication between the two teams becomes yet another issue to resolve, as seen in the case of School B

in which the two teams reported having no communication between one another. For larger schools, perhaps a better solution to forming two separate teams is for the initial team to develop spin-off teams with leadership provided by the original team members. This was the more effective model used at School D during the Spring semester.

As stated earlier, teams can release untapped resources for schools, both within the teams themselves and outside them. Use of resources in terms of sharing, ability to ask for help, and creativity in terms of application had an impact on the effectiveness of teams. A resource is defined as "something that can be turned to for support and help, or an available supply that can be drawn upon when needed." Resources can be shared on the teams themselves and the more sharing within the team of individual skills, the more powerful the team perceives itself in solving problems, the more control it feels over the problem defined. As stated in the description of the teams in Chapter V, the use of team resources by School D was exemplary and so were their Key Results. A sharing of resources between school teams contributed to the growth of awareness for the small teams from School E and F, helping them to be less pessimistic about their small size. Teams which experienced more success also reported using more outside resources such as University faculty members from

Amherst, whereas teams which were less successful and one which even dissolved reported no discussion of the possibility of using outside resources when they got off the track or bogged down. Outside resources and particularly the resources which the University facilitators can bring to the teams can give the teams an external influence which can add a new perspective to a problem which a team may be too close to see clearly. Teams which knew when to ask for help formulated clearer plans than those who continued to work alone. This is also an indication of group maturity substantiated by researchers of organizational growth and development.

#4 Team Norms for Communication and Interaction. From the data collected in this and other studies in schools, the theme of isolation in the teaching profession has been cited by many. One of the great advantages of school-based teams, especially those composed of both teachers and administrators, is the increased opportunity for communication and interaction. When one considers the University model which includes weekly meetings of all the teams from the different schools together, then the possibilities for interaction increase exponentially.

Communication patterns in organizations are complex and research in this area is extensive. For the schools in

this study, some effective communication patterns can help make the teams more successful and more satisfying for the participants. For example, teams on which the headmaster shared his priorities for the school as a whole and then worked with the team on plans to reach those priorities resulted in a stronger commitment on the part of team members, as in the case of School D, where every member interviewed articulated these same organizational objectives.

Communication between teams can help participants challenge negative practices at their own schools because they begin to see that the way their school operates is not necessarily the way things have to be. Interaction at the Monday seminars motivated teachers to make these comparisons. And interaction between the University facilitators and teams with non-supportive headmasters can begin to drive a wedge into the school operation and expose these organizations which have successfully kept themselves from any public scrutiny for years.

The team model increases opportunities for communication and interaction of participants in a variety of ways. At the school level, this interaction occurs within the team itself, between the headmaster and the team members, whether he participates actively on the teams or not. In this way, issues that have remained below the

surface can be raised and once raised, must be dealt with. This was the strategy employed at School G where the administration had very little communication with the rest of the faculty and even the required city-wide inservice sessions were handled by an administrative assistant. The team chose communication as its topic and through the forums, at least a small number of teachers at the school became aware that some people at the school were trying to do something. Thus the team model can increase communication among team and non-team members at the school. The team from School E took over one of the inservice sessions to speak with the entire faculty. And two teams made presentations to their Faculty Senates and although the reception in both cases was negative, more people were aware that at least some groups in the school were ready to deal with some substantive issues successfully avoided for years. The team model is also responsible for, in most cases, creating a communication network among schools in the system in the weekly seminars. During these seminars there are opportunities provided to create support networks for headmasters, who can begin to share the common frustrations of their difficult positions and provide an atmosphere where its all right to admit that one is not in complete control of the school he operates. At these sessions and even more so at

the mini-sabbaticals, this model provides interaction with University faculty (even the two-hour drive was mentioned by one teacher as a unique opportunity to get to know her headmaster). And finally, community involvement in the schools can be a direct outcome of the team model as teams take advantage of resources yet to be tapped in their communities.

Regular communication builds up trust and caring among team participants. Only one team from School B showed evidence of mistrust and confusion among team members who expressed resentment about work done by them and never used and grades which were undeservedly shared. But for teams in the other schools, reports show that the sharing and cooperation were excellent, and some characterized their team relations by explaining, "there's a warmth there, a caring." At one school, School F, there was a very high degree of trust between the headmaster and the two teacher members. They reported being able to discuss confidential problems in the school with the assurance that no trust would be violated nor any reprisals for disagreeing with the headmaster.

The content of the communication is another important aspect of this variable. Data reveal that teams which allowed for the articulation of both task and maintenance functions had more effective teams than those which

concentrated on one of these group functions. At School A, which showed a high sensitivity to group maintenance functions, the team was unable to succeed in the task of developing a Key Results Plan until they broke the deadlock by examining team members' learning preferences, some of whom required decision and action rather than discussion. But both teams at School B indicated a strong emphasis on task, especially the one team left during the Spring semester. Those interviewed who had dropped out of the program expressed that their needs, their concerns, and even the results of their work were not listened to or used by the team. One said that a member of the team just sat through the meetings saying nothing, but no one ever checked out his silence, no one played the role of "gatekeeper."

The questionnaire data indicate that there was a high degree of task and maintenance functions operating within the teams, according to 54% of those who had participated. At the team meeting observed at School G, these functions were exhibited throughout the two hour meeting. For example, the team leader repeated the discussion for late comers so they could join in the discussion. Members' ideas were encouraged with positive comments by the leader, such as "good idea." The leader encouraged silent members to speak, though members did initially speak back to the

leader and not to the group as a whole. The leader made suggestions but immediately asked for feedback, also recalling earlier suggestions of members. There was also considerable joking which was observed as a tension release. And at this particular meeting, members were also observed bringing the group back to task after the joking.

Team Norms. In addition to communication patterns, teams which displayed certain norms or patterns of behavior were more effective than others. A norm is defined as a "standard, a model or a pattern regarded as typical for a specific group." Norms can be written in the form of rules, can be unwritten but observed consistently in the operation of a group, and can include both negative and positive rules with sanctions protecting them from even being brought into question.

Mutual dependability among team members or a cooporation which was practiced beyond the work of the teams was one strong norm for some teams, which would generate cycles of positive reinforcement and a sense that "I can count on them."

The greater the willingness to submerge self-interest to group goals, the higher was the probability of team success. Teams in which consensus on the goal of the team, rather than adherence to one's own interests was another important norm for team members to accept.

Teams with a norm for dealing with conflict were more effective than those which refused to admit or deal with any conflict.

Teams exhibiting the norm of attention to both task and maintenance functions in their group processes were more effective than those which concentrated on one function for the group.

Teams on which members interacted with one another, teachers and administrators, as "colleagues" were more effective than those which reported automatic acceptance of the headmaster as leader and also accepted his suggestion for choosing a problem without debate.

In tandem with the norm of colleagueship among teachers and administrators on the teams was the ability of interacting on the teams as individuals, dropping the titles and role definitions and interacting as team members rather than as "department head" or "assistant headmaster."

As the preceding discussion indicates, the five variables are difficult to elucidate individually because they interact synergistically with one another. The organization of the school and the leadership of the school and the team interact. The make-up of the team has an effect on the communication and interaction patterns among team members which in turn established the norms of team behavior. And the effectiveness of the team is dependent

on all of the above in addition to the type of problem which they chose to work on and the resources that are available for use as teams implement their improvement plans.

#5 Goals or Purposes of the Teams for Individuals, for the Schools and for the Program. Data indicate that the teams functioned for a variety of purposes for individual teachers, headmasters and the schools, and for the University Program itself. Research on groups shows that the task of problem-solving is one of the most difficult for a group to take in, bringing members to high levels of tension, anxiety and frustration. It is extremely important that a problem-solving team have a focusing device such as the Key Results model within which they can frame their problems in positive terms and have steps or intermediate improvements to indicate the direction they should take and to alter those intermediate steps when necessary. Force field analysis is another technique which also includes the positive side of a problem; that is, the resources or driving forces which a team has in its favor for solving the problem as well as the negative or restraining forces which, without a model such as the force field analysis, usually get the group's attention under the rubric heard many times at meetings that "it can't be

done." Data including class observations in the Fall semester show teams having a great deal of difficulty in using the Key Results model. One school in particular, School F, noted that they could express many problems at the school in negative terms but had difficulty expressing positive outcomes or Key Results. They were able to succeed in a more positive expression of intended outcomes with the help of one of the University facilitators. As the teams became more adept at using this problem-solving device, many teams reported using it in other areas at school and one teacher was using it with her students.

Another purpose which the team filled for individual members was that of a support group, even for projects outside the scope of the team's work. And for one administrator at School A, the team functioned as a validation of his curriculum ideas whose acceptance he had fought for in meetings with members of the school itself as well as central administration and the School Committee. And for another teacher at School G, the team gave him a new reason to try again, rekindling the hope factor that there was still a chance to do something which would help conditions in the school.

For the schools, it is important that the teams not only have clear goals, but it also appears important that they develop both long and short term goals. If they have

only long term goals there is the danger of frustration setting in on the team and a sense in the school that nothing is being accomplished, as at School A which developed the five year plan and then struggled defensively during the evaluation phase because they had no measureable goals after the year. At the other extreme, School B had concise, short term goals for that school year and succeeded in implementing and completing their project, but there was no evidence that the team was looking beyond this goal, even though there would continue to be the same need at the school for the next class of students. School D showed the most successful blending of both short and long term goals. The long term goal of improving the educational climate of the school, an ambitious and elusive goal, was broken down into short term goals aimed at immediate improvements of organizational procedures, many of which were implemented by the end of the year and showing success.

A Force Field Analysis of Team Variables

Another way of looking at the interaction of the conditions or variables necessary for effective school teams is to use a force field analysis. Many of these variables can be seen as operating as <u>both</u> driving forces

and restraining forces, indicating the subtlety of the application of these variables in designing school teams. For example, the size of the team can be both a driving force and a restraining force. If it is too large or too small, this variable can act as a restraining force, hampering consensus or not developing a constituency. If it is large enough to represent a "critical mass" of the faculty population, then the size can give added impetus and add resources to the task of the team. Building consensus can be both a driving force and a restraining force and is related to the size of the team. As a driving force, consensus unites and strengthens team cohesiveness and a sharing of mutual goals. But it is also restraining, taking a great deal of time and extensive, patient deliberation. Many teams expressed frustration in regard to trying to reach a consensus which brought them close to quitting as in the reports from Schools A, D and G. Outside resources, particularly the court-ordered college pairings set up with each high and middle school can operate dually as driving and restraining forces in terms of the teams' identifying as the "U. Mass. teams." The question of "turf" becomes an issue as a restraining force because it would be particularly detrimental to the relationship between the school and its court-ordered pairing if it were implied that the U. Mass. team was

duplicating services which were the legitimate responsibility of the college partners of the school. On the other hand, some schools, notably School D, have turned this to their advantage. The coordinators of its collaborative college partner are also members of the U. Mass. team at the school. Thus the school team can take advantage of both institutions as resources. And the instability of the system, which is obviously a restraining force for the teams, can in some way operate as a driving force since accountability and the reporting of operational procedures are left to local control due to the preoccupation of central administration with the budgetary crisis. This leaves possibilities open for the schools to develop and implement their key results plans autonomously. And finally, the lack of structure afforded the school-based teams by the intervention agent, the University, can also operate as both a driving and restraining force. Many participants, particularly those interviewed who dropped out of the program, complained of the lack of structure to the "course," preferring a more traditional lecture method which they experienced throughout their pre- and inservice training. Other participants brought the lack of structure up as a positive force, allowing them to search within themselves, each other, and their school for solutions to their problems, rather than being told what to do and how to do it.

Some of the other variables under study operate antagonistically. For example, a repeated theme throughout the data is the isolation felt by those in the teaching profession, especially acute at the larger schools. Adding to the sense of isolation in the organization of the schools are the hierarchical authority patterns and the adversarial relationship between teachers and administrators. Yet the driving force of interaction and communication afforded by team membership, the opportunity for increased sharing of power and leadership, the strengthening of colleagueship, and increased opportunity of interaction between teachers and administrators which are characteristics of the team model, can mitigate those restraining forces. Other driving forces which can lessen the isolation are the rewards of team interaction stated in the interviews such as the support group nature of the team, the validation of individual views, concerns, and philosophies, and the opportunity, especially for teacher members, to get an overview of the school, its operations, its problems, and to share in the formulation of organizational objectives with administrators.

Teacher burnout is another restraining force for team participation. Yet research in education and other fields has shown that the driving force of sharing in decision-making, access to power, and the psychic rewards

of support and validation of one's ideas can all work toward reversing the negative spiral which characterizes those who get "burnt out."

Another restraining force for team participation and success is the operation of negative norms in many of the schools - many school faculties remain in their closed-door classrooms during the day and leave at the first dismissal bell. Criticizing the administration is a favorite subject of teacher room talk. It is not considered "normal" to meet with the headmaster on your own time and work on school-wide issues; lesson plans and classroom paper work are considered the teachers' responsibilities, not administrative problems. Yet a driving force apparent in many interviews of teachers who were staying long hours in the headmaster's conference room was a reversal of these negative norms. And the possibility exists that their example may pique the curiosity of those leaving and perhaps cause others to question their swift departures and the blinders they have donned which only focus their attention on their classrooms. This driving force can even carry across schools. For example, in the Monday seminars, ineffective teams can see effective teams in operation and know what is possible, know that what they are experiencing in frustration and failure is not a given for their school because other schools in the same system can experience

membership in productive, professional teams and this exposure can give them the courage to make more demands on themselves, their leadership, and the other members of their faculty because that's not the way things have to be. This exposure can push them to question the negative norms which are frustrating their team's attempts at success. This view of the teams at other schools is a unique opportunity in the Boston Public Schools, for at the time of this study, the only other time that teachers from the various schools are brought together is at meetings of the Boston Teacher's Union and these meetings are not open to administrators.

C H A P T E R V I I

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The School of Education of the University of Massachusetts is committed to working with administrators and teachers, especially in urban areas, to improve individual outcomes for youth. A major goal of its program in the Boston Secondary Schools is the return of public faith in the effectiveness of urban public schools and of the possibilities that University and Boston Public School personnel can learn to collaborate together in ways that may provide a model to help others around the country. Results of the first year of implementation of the Boston Secondary Schools Program are promising and indicate that the potential for improving the schools is heartening.

In one year people learned to deal with their own morale and how it affects school outcomes. People have begun to work not on symptoms but on real problems and to acknowledge that they need help. New ideas have been discussed and plans for improvement have been shared among schools. Norms that now characterize this group of school personnel include a sharing of ideas, resources, comprehensive exam papers, and committee participation by members in individual degree programs and dissertation proposals. New friendships have been forged and there is

still an aura of optimism despite the paucity of public support for the school system. While the potential for success is enormous, the work to achieve measureable results for the individual schools remains to be done.

As a result of an analysis of this model for school improvement after one year of implementation and evaluation of the project in interviews with the University facilitators,[1] the following specific and general recommendations are suggested.

Recommendations

Although there is a need for "creative ambiguity" in the design of this approach to school improvement, there needs to be a balance of structure or direction on the part of the University facilitators. Opportunities were missed because the school teams need more direction and material presented on what other schools outside Boston have done and they need more of a reliance on research findings. Not all new ideas and solutions can be pulled out of the groups. The teams need to be able to tolerate this ambiguity as they move forward and they need to articulate their responsibility to solve school problems.

There is a need for headmasters who are enthusiastic about teamwork and if they don't provide direct leadership, then they must be able to supply encouragement.

The Key Results approach is good because it requires teams to be constantly in the process of examining the Key Results Plan. Other problem-solving techniques should be given to the teams for experimentation.

A major problem is to get people to see the school as their major focus and not the Program.

Expansion plans for the teams both within the schools and within the Program need to be developed.

The University needs to share its philosophy and long-range plans with the participants.

A cost benefit analysis should be developed by the University to show how important and efficient this model of staff development for school improvement is; for example, the number of dissertations or research studies conducted in the Boston School System, the number of hours spent after school working on teams, and other benefits to the schools.

School plans need measureable results.

There should be an awareness of the problem of working with people and raising their expectations and then letting them go. The University facilitators must work along with them and set up small steps of reinforcement with the Key Results Plans.

The University facilitators have to intervene more with the headmasters.

More awareness of the training backgrounds needs to be considered in the design of the program; that is, teachers tend to be more goal-oriented and need structure and group process skills.

More literature and more discussions and bibliographies should be available. Teams need a way to test assumptions and teachers need to change perceptions of themselves because they have a very low self-esteem.

The potential for cross-faculty interactions among universities working in the schools should be explored, such as Simmons, the Harbor Campus of the University of Massachusetts, the Principal's Center at the Harvard Graduate School of Education, and other members of school collaborations and cultural organizations.

There is a need for diversity in course offerings in addition to school-based teams.

The University needs measures of its own success, such as statistics on how many people stayed with the program until the end of the Spring Semester, especially the number who started in January, 1981, and the feedback on the mini-sabbaticals.

The Monday sessions need more continuity and more content.

The University team should go through the Key Results process and share its long-range goals with participants.

It should be recognized that the major achievement of the first year of this program was bringing all of those people together from the various schools because schools in Boston have been so self-contained, there is no other mechanism in the system other than the Boston Teachers' Union meetings for people to hear and see one another and even these meetings exclude administrators. This in itself is a service.

The headmaster as leader with the team support, gathering that support and putting it together in a cohesive fashion made more difference than any other variation of team leadership and membership.

The University should endeavor to target schools which have been traditionally underserved, where people have not been asked to work together around common problems and have not been given the opportunity to work with the University on their problems.

It should be recognized that the model of teachers and principals working together is very important to the design of this program. Teachers especially have not been asked for their views or their experience to participate and work with the principal, to help reduce the level of awe or at least the distance that generally exists between the principal and the faculty and get them to define collectively where the school wants to go.

University facilitators should see themselves not as instructors but as "ex officio" members of school teams.

Teams should be exposed to harder problem solving skills as they progress, such as techniques of Organizational Development.

Specific Recommendations for School Teams

School A: The team needs to recruit more teachers and involve teachers from several vocational clusters. A more structured relationship between the team and the headmaster should be developed in which he meets periodically with the entire team.

School B: Team building strategies should be developed and implemented with the aid of experienced group facilitators. For example, it was a strategic error to split the two teams after two topics had been decided on. If the separate teams had had the opportunity to choose their own topics, there would have been more of a chance at arriving at a consensus. Leadership is another important consideration. If the headmaster does not preside over team meetings, then his designee should be established. Having two people take turns should not be allowed in the structure of the teams. There has to be a commitment to the team by the leader in all phases of the team's work

both in Boston and Amherst. The team should be encouraged to develop long term goals or to acknowledge the deeper issues underlying the success of their Key Results Plans. If two teams are necessary, a mechanism for their cross-communication should be established. The environment of the meetings is also important, for example, sitting around a conference table in the headmaster's office encourages serious work more than using the teachers' lounge for meetings.

School C: Members of the team should be encouraged to initiate sub-committees so that work gets expanded to other teachers in the school besides those chosen by the headmaster for team membership.

School D: This team made great progress in the first year of Program implementation and is ready to tackle some comprehensive educational issues for the school. They should be encouraged to experiment with including representative students and parents into their team.

School E: This team needs to expand its membership and also needs to recruit members of the administration to join its team.

School F: This team could profit by developing a long range Key Results Plan to help them socialize the teachers. This plan should be very well developed, perhaps using theory and research by Chris Argyris and Donald

Schon, for, as the headmaster stated, if people sense that the team is questioning the quality of their teaching, they will become even further entrenched in their reluctance to question the failures of their students. Parental support of the plan for helping students could be another Key Result.

School G: Team meeting agendas should be presented to the headmaster after all meetings to keep him abreast of the discussions and problems posed by the team and solutions under discussion. He should also be encouraged to attend the forums set up by the team.

Recommendations for Further Research

A similar study using the interview, questionnaire, and participant observer methodology should be conducted of the teams in their second year of operation.

Team leaders should be studied, particularly those that are headmasters, in order to refine the actual components of the role and work toward a prioritizing of their leadership functions.

Many participants are working on similar research projects and a convergence of these individual efforts could be coordinated into a major report or special journal.

As staff changes are made throughout the city, the effects of these changes on teams should be studied.

Summary

In the first year of implementation, the Boston Secondary Schools Program has achieved some positive results. For participants, it was an opportunity to be recognized as an educational force within their buildings and within the secondary school population. The Program drew together people who are not traditionally the leaders in the schools, people who never got the chance to speak up in faculty meetings and who are not heads of departments with easy access to their headmasters but who are interested in the overall atmosphere and direction of their schools. The Program allowed them to take leadership positions with their headmasters and make presentations to faculty members which is important both personally and professionally.

The schools in Boston move along traditional lines or patterns of secondary school organization of departments and repetitive curricula with little or no opportunity for staff development, little or no innovation. The schools couldn't help but profit even if the Key Results Plans were unambitious or illusory because it was a start of giving some focus to problems in the schools. There was also the opportunity for exposure, even in a negative sense when "outsiders" such as University personnel and evaluation

teams from other schools visited schools long accustomed to keeping their doors shut and their problems unscrutinized. Even in schools with non-cooperating headmasters, it was very difficult to keep people in the schools from working on problems and bringing a certain visibility to the situation at the school.

For the Boston School System, it is premature to judge the impact of the Program. However, even at this early stage it may offer some help in the design of the new Professional Development Institute being proposed by the School Committee as a major staff development effort. The present design separates principals and teachers in their professional development and utilizes inservice time during the school year and summer institutes away from the school site for improving staffs. The team model may help convince the leadership of the system that it is time to recognize and utilize the talents of their own teachers and administrators and the synergistic empowering that the model of collaboration on teams releases for the schools. The reality-based nature of the Program responds to the needs of the participants and provides them with sufficient skills to help them be of service to their schools on an on-going basis. The Program has the potential to demonstrate to teachers and administrators that there are ways that they themselves can solve their problems in their

own schools and improve learning outcomes for students. In addition, the model of the Boston Secondary Schools Program for school improvement can become an empowering and enabling strategy for teachers and administrators as they define their roles as educators, drawing them together to begin a thoughtful dialogue at this crucible for public education. And as we become less self-conscious in this new mode of interaction, as we drop the titles and roles and restrictions of the traditional school hierarchy, we can extend that thoughtful dialogue to other members of the educational community - the parents and students, and other social institutions which share in the process of educating the young. As Goodlad stated, "Our schools must be reconstructed, one by one, by citizens and educators working together. Nothing less will suffice."[2]

Conclusion

James B. Conant observed twenty years ago that by the year 2059 historians will regard the American educational system as it was perfected at the end of the twentieth century as one of the finest products of democracy. Yet recently Stanford Dean J. Myron Atkin wrote that it is conceivable that we are witnessing the dismantling of universal public education.[3] Former School

Superintendent Robert Wood wrote that our schools suffer today from the same malaises that now afflict most of our institutions: a loss of the sense of mission and purpose; the loss of a confidence in a continuity from the past through the present to a certain future; and also, the instinctive general support for established institutions. Our vulnerability to society's disillusion is due in part to the way educational institutions are structured and deployed. To Wood, these characteristics were not critical until the schools began taking on more and more responsibilities, many of which are contradictory.[4] And Dean Mario Fantini elaborated on this dilemma at a recent symposium in Boston on "Quality Education" when he distinguished between "schooling" and "education."[5] Schools are not the only educators of youth, especially in our complex society of advanced communications. What is needed is a reconnecting of all the educators of the young - the family, peer groups, the community at large, - as well as the schools. As educators, we can facilitate this process, we can become the orchestrators and articulators of this educational process so that students receive the resources and the reinforcement for becoming educated. This facilitation must be done in collaboration with the other institutions which educate our students and we must be clear on our roles and responsibilities in this educational process.

The goal or process of becoming educated is more than just developing the ability to decode the language, compute accurately, and acquire other basic skills. It is the development of the whole person, the discovery of talent and potentials, the discernment of a critical thinker, and it is a lifelong process. We in the public schools are responsible for beginning and developing a part of that process. Parents and the larger community are responsible for other parts. When the total learning environments for the child connect and collaborate in such a way as to maximize the learning experiences, then the educational process can be rich, productive, and provocative. We who work in urban schools know that the maturing environments for many of our students can be fraught with destructive experiences and contradictory messages, which can cause a dangerous alienation for them.[6] Parental support and caring can be non-existent and the cultivation of self-worth can be left to chance. We have taken on many more roles beyond schooling because we see the needs of our students on a daily basis as they face crises in their young lives that many of us as adults would find debilitating. And yet the role we must play to help them make sense of the world, to understand the past and preside over the unfolding of the future, to develop their values and discover their skills is all the more vital to those of

us who have experienced the struggle of the urban environment and the value that an education can have to lift us out of the negativity and hopelessness and bring us to a realization of some of our potential and a refinement of our values. We must come together to make this experience of education a positive and uplifting one for our students. Working together first among ourselves to better articulate our goals for our schools and then reaching out to garner the support and share the responsibility with the larger community is our task. The Boston Secondary Schools Program is one small step in this direction.

Footnotes

[1]See Appendix D for interview questions used with the University faculty.

[2]Goodlad, What Schools Are For, p. 68.

[3]Verne A. Stadtman, "Editorial Projects in Education," Education Week, Cover Letter.

[4]Robert C. Wood, "The Disassembling of American Education," Daedalus, Vol. 55 (January, 1981), p. 99.

[5]Fantini, "Quality Education."

[6]Fred M. Newmann, "Reducing Student Alienation in High Schools: Implications of Theory," Harvard Educational Review, Vol. 51, No. 4 (November, 1981), p. 552.

B I B L I O G R A P H Y

Abramowitz et al. High School '77: A Survey of Public Secondary School Principals. Washington, D.C.:National Institute of Education, 1978.

Alschuler, Alfred, ed. Teacher Burnout. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association Publications, 1980.

Anrig, Commissioner Gregory. "Rethinking Inservice Education," Boston University Conference, April 3, 1980.

Apply, Dee G. and Winder, Alvin E. "An Evolving Definition of Collaboration and Some Implications for the World of Work," Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences. Vol. 13, No. 3, (July-August-September, 1977), 264-267.

Argyris, Chris. Interpersonal Competence and Organizational Effectiveness. Homewood, Ill.: Dorsey Press, 1962.

Argyris, Chris. Intervention Theory and Method. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesly Publishing Co., 1970.

Argyris, Chris. "Personality and Organization Theory Revisited," Administrative Science Quarterly. (1973), 141-167.

Argyris, Chris and Schon, Donald A., Organizational Learning: A Theory of Action Perspective. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley Publishing Co., 1978.

Bailey, William J. and Morrill, Leslie. "Improving Instruction Through Research Based Staff Development," Educational Technology. Vol. XX, No. 9 (September, 1980), 41-43.

Bailey, William J. and Neale, Daniel C. "Teachers and School Improvement," Educational Forum. Vol. XLV, No. 1. (November 1980), 72-85.

Bailey, William J. Neale, Daniel C., and Ross, Billy E. Strategies for School Improvement: Cooperative Planning and Organization Development. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1981.

Barth, Roland. "The Principal As Staff Developer," Journal of Education (Boston University). Vol. 163, No. 2. (Spring, 1980), 144-162.

Bassett, G. W. Educational Administration and The Professional Development of Teachers. Paper presented at the National Conference of the Australian Council for Educational Administrators. August, 1977. ERIC Document Reproduction Service, ED 146 670, 1977.

Benne, Kenneth. "Collaboration in Work Settings," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. Vol. 13, No. 3. (July-August-September, 1977), 261-263.

Bennis, Warren, ed. The Planning of Change: Readings in the Applied Behavioral Sciences. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1961.

Bennis, Warren G. Changing Organizations: Essays on the Development and Evaluation of Human Organizations. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1966.

Bennis, Warren G. American Bureaucracy. New Jersey: Aldine Publishing Co., 1970.

Bentzen, Mary, et al. Changing Schools: The Magic Feather Principal. New York: McGraw-Hill Publishing, 1974.

Bentzen, Mary M., Williams, Richard C., and Heckman, Paul. "A Study of Schooling: Adult Experiences in Schools." Phi Delta Kappan (February, 1980), 394-397.

Berman, Paul, and McLaughlin, Milbrey. Federal Programs Supporting Educational Change, Vol. VIII, Implementing and Sustaining Innovations, Santa Monica, California; Rand Corporation, 1978.

Bernstein, Paul. Workplace Democratization: Its Internal Dynamics. New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1980.

Bishop, Leslie J. Staff Development and Instructional Improvement: Plans and Procedures. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1976.

Callahan, Raymond. Education and the Cult of Efficiency. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Caplow, Theodore. Principles of Organization. New York: Harcourt Brace & World, Inc., 1964.

Carew, Doanld et al. "New York State Division for Youth: A Collaborative Approach to the Implementation of Structural Change in a Public Bureaucracy," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. Vol. 13, No. 3 (July-August-September, 1977), 327-339.

Cohen, Muriel. "Studying Problems, Planning Improvements," Boston Globe. July 9, 1981, p. 32.

Cohen, Muriel. "Public Schools, Does Anyone Care?" Boston Globe. July 5, 1981, p. 1.

Cohen, Muriel. "2 1/2 Feeds Interest in Private Schools," Boston Globe. December 15, 1980, p. 21.

Cole, Stephen. The Sociological Method: An Introduction to the Science of Sociology. Chicago: Rand McNally Co., 1980.

Crandall, David P. "An Executive Director's Struggle to Actualize His Commitment to Collaboration," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. Vol. 13. No. 3. (July-August-September, 1977), 340-350.

Crockenberg, Vincent, and Clark, Woodrow W., Jr. "Teaching Participation in School Decision Making: The San Jose Teacher Involvment Project," Phi Delta Kappan, (October, 1979), 115-118.

Cross, Ray. "A Description of Decision-Making Patterns of School Principals," Journal of Educational Research, Vol 73, No. 3 (Jan-Feb. 1980), 154-155.

Divoky, Diane. "Burden of the Seventies: The Management of Decline," Phi Delta Kappan (October, 1979), 87-92.

DuVall, Lloyd A., and Erickson, Kenneth A. "School Management Teams: What Are They and How Do They Work?" National Association of School Principals. Vol. 65, No. 445 (May, 1981), 62-65.

Eisenstadt, S.N. ed. Max Weber: On Charisma and Institution Building, Selected Papers. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1968.

Elmore, Richard F. "Organizational Models of Social Program Implementation," Public Policy. Vol. 26, No. 2 (Spring, 1978), 185-228.

Fantini, Mario. "Quality Education: What Is It And How Do We Get It?" City-Wide Education Coalition Symposium Keynote Address. University of Massachusetts, Boston, April 12, 1980.

Garrity, Judge W. Arthur. The Boston School Decision. Boston: The Community Action Committee of Paperback Booksmith, reproduced from Volume 379, No. 2 of the Federal Supplement Dated October 21, 1974.

Gartland, Arthur J. Facts About the Phase II Desegregation Plan In Boston: 1975 - 1976 Academic Year. Boston: City-Wide Coordinating Council, n.d.

Gilligan, Arlene. "Relationship Between Incentive Style and Effective Leadership," Phi Delta Kappan (April, 1980), 567-568.

Goodlad, John I. Facing the Future: Issues in Education and Schooling. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1976.

Goodlad, John I. What Schools Are For. Los Angeles: University of California, L.A. and Institute for Development of Educational Activities, Inc., A Publication of the Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1979.

Goslin, Davis A. The School In Contemporary Society. Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Co., 1965.

Gross, Neal. Who Runs Our Schools? New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1958.

Gross, Neal, and Herriot, Robert E. Staff Leadership in Public Schools: A Sociological Inquiry. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1965.

Gross, Neal, and Trask, Anne E. The Sex Factor and the Management of Schools. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1976.

Hall, Jay. Systems Maintenance: Gatekeeping and the Involvement Process. Monroe, Texas: Telemetrics, Inc., 1969.

Johnson, M. Claradine. The Principal in the 1980's: Instructional Leader, Manager. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1981.

Joyce, Bruce, and Showers, Beverly, "Improving Inservice Training: The Messages of Research," Educational Leadership II (February, 1980), 379-385.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. Men and Women of the Corporation. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1979.

Kanter, Rosabeth Moss. and Stein, Barry A., ed. Life in Organizations: Workplaces as People Experience Them. New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1979.

Katz, Michael B. Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools. New York: Praeger Press, 1971.

Keys, Christopher, and Bartunek, Jean M. "OD in Schools: Goal Agreement, Process Skills, and Diffusion of Change," Journal of Applied Behavioral Science. Vol. 15, No. 1 (Jan-Feb-March, 1979), 61-78.

Knox, William G. et al. Power or Pawn: Leadership and the Department Head, A Resource Booklet. Ontario: Ontario Secondary School Teachers' Federation, 1977.

Levine, Charles. "Leadership: Problems, Prospects and Implications of Research Programs," The Policy Studies Journal, Vol. 5, No. 1 (Autumn, 1976), 120-125.

LeGendre, Margaret Fraher. "Mechanisms for Secondary School Change: A Case Study of the English High Teachers' Center," University of Massachusetts Dissertation, September, 1979.

Lieberman, Ann and Miller, Lynne, ed. Staff Development: New Demands, New Realities, New Perspectives. New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University, 1978.

Likert, Rensis. The Human Organization: Its Management and Value. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1967.

Likert, Rensis. New Patterns of Management. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1961.

Lortie, Dan. Schoolteacher: A Sociological Study. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

MacGregor, Douglas. The Human Side of Enterprise. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1960.

Mann, Dale. "Making Change Happen?" Teachers College Record, Vol. 77, No. 3 (February, 1976), 314-331.

McDermott, Betty, "We Are All In This Together," Thrust, ACSA Foundation for Educational Administrators, Vol. 10, No. 1 (October, 1980), 30-31.

McLaughlin, Corrine, "Doing Business Cooperatively," New Roots. No. 19 (Holiday, 1981), 39-42.

McPherson, Bruce. "Are They In Roses? Teachers and Staff Development," Journal of Education (Boston University). Vol. 163, No. 2 (September, 1981), 120-133.

Moeller, Gerald H. and Mahan, David J. The Faculty Team: School Organization for Results. Chicago: Science Research Associates, Inc., 1971.

Nadler, Barbara, and Merron, Myrna, "Collaboration: A Model for Survival For Schools of Education," Journal of Education (Boston University) Vol. 162, No. 4 (Fall, 1980), 134-142.

Newmann, Fred M. "Reducing Student Alienation in High Schools: Implications of Theory," Harvard Educational Review. Vol. 51, No. 4 (November, 1981), 547-560.

Oppenheim, A. N. Questionnaire Design. New York: Basic Books, Inc. 1966.

Pellicer, Leonard O. and Nemeth, Gyuri, "Tired of Carrying the World on Your Shoulders? Try Team Management," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. Vol. 64 (November, 1980), 97-102.

Perrow, Charles. Organizational Analysis: A Sociological View. California: Brooks/Cole Publishers, 1970.

Pick, Karen. "Curriculum Implementation and the Role of the Principal: A Study of the Elementary Schools in One District of Boston." University of Massachusetts Dissertation, February, 1980.

Pittman, Robert B., and Cloud, Lewis E. "Major Problems in Public Education From the Students' Perspective," Phi Delta Kappan (February, 1980), 425.

Powers, John. "Hub School Year Was Touch and Go," Boston Globe. June 21, 1981, p. 1.

Reed, Horace. "Staff Development Class Notes," School of Education, University of Massachusetts. Spring, 1979.

Rogus, Joseph F., and Martin, Mary, "Principals and Staff Development: Countering the School Culture," Clearing House, Vol. 53, No. 1 (September, 1979), 28-32.

Rutter, Michael, et al. Fifteen Thousand Hours. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1979.

Sarason, Seymour B. The Culture of the School and the Problem of Change. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc., 1971.

Saunders, Robert L., Phillips, Ray C., and Johnson, Harold T. A Theory of Educational Leadership. Columbus, Ohio: Charles E. Merrill Books, Inc., 1966.

Schmuck, Richard A. et al. The Second Handbook of Organizational Development in Schools. Oregon: Mayflower Publishing Co., 1977

Schmuck, Richard A., and Runkel, Philip J. Organizational Training For A School Faculty. Eugene, Ore.: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration. 1970.

Schrag, Peter. Village School Downtown: Politics and Education: A Boston Project. Boston: Beacon Press, 1967.

Schatzman, Leonard, and Strauss, Anselm. Field Research. New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 1973.

Seifert, Dr. Kenneth, "Analyzing and Choosing Leadership Styles," Northeast Coalition of Educational Leaders Conference Lecture, October 2, 1980.

Sexton, Patricia Cayo. The American School: A Sociological Analysis. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 1967.

Silberman, Charles E. Crisis in The Classroom: The Remaking of American Education. New York: Vintage Books, A Division of Random House, 1970.

Smith, H. W. Strategies of Social Research. New Jersey: Prentice Hall. 1975.

Statdman, Verne A. "Editorial Projects in Education," Education Week. Cover Letter. n.d.

Staw, Barry M., and Ross, Jerry, "Commitment in an Experimenting Society," Journal of Applied Psychology. Vol. 65, No. 3 (1980), 249-260.

Stec, Philip. "Staff Development: Approaches in Theory and Practice," University of Massachusetts Dissertation, August, 1978.

Sweeney, Jim. "Principals vs. Teachers," Phi Delta Kappan (April, 1980), p. 565.

"The School Year in Review," The Boston Globe, May 2, 1981, p. 24.

Timpane, Michael. "View From America: Current Research on Effective Schools," Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin, Vol. XXV, No. 1 (Fall, 1980), p. 14.

Toffler, Alvin. Future Shock. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.

Trist, Eric. "Collaboration in Work Settings: A Personal Perspective" Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences, Vol. 13, No. 3 (July-August-September, 1977), 268-278.

Tyack, David B. The One Best System: A History of American Urban Education. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1974.

Tyack, David B. "Urban Education: Is Bureaucratic Leadership Possible?" Harvard Graduate School of Education Bulletin,Vol. XXV, No. 1 (Fall, 1980), 38.

Walker, Donald E. "The Effective Administrator," Reviewed in Phi Delta Kappan by Patrick Leonard (April, 1980), 571.

Waller, Willard. The Sociology of Teaching. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1932.

Walters, Donald L. "The Measurement of Administrative Competencies," Phi Delta Kappan, Vol. 61, No. 6 (February, 1980), 423-424.

West, Philip T., and Armstrong, Jane. "Charisma: Studying Its Elusive Nature," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin, Vol. 64 (October, 1980), 70-77.

White, Ralph, and Lippitt, Ronald. Autocracy and Democracy: An Experimental Inquiry. New York: Harper & Bros., 1960.

Williams, Robert T. "Teacher Motivation and Satisfaction," National Association of Secondary School Principals Bulletin. Vol. 62 (December, 1978), 89-94.

Wood, Robert C. "The Disassembling of American Education," Daedalus. Vol. 55 (January, 1981), 99-113.

Woodman, Richard W., and Sherwood, John J. "Effects of Team Development Intervention: A Field Experiment," Journal of Applied Behavioral Sciences. Vol. 16 (April-May-June, 1980), 211-227.

Yankelovich, David. "Turbulence in the Working World: Angry Workers, Happy Grads," Psychology Today. Vol. 8 (December, 1974), 80-82.

Yankelovich, David. "New Rules in American Life: Searching For Self-Fulfillment in a World Turned Upside Down," Psychology Today. Vol. 15, No. 4 (April, 1981), 35-91.

Zaleznick, Abraham, and Moment, David. The Dynamics of Interpersonal Behavior. New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc., 1964.

APPENDIX A

Boston Secondary Schools Program Abstract

The Boston Secondary Schools Program
of the University of Massachusetts
School of Education
1980-81 Component

Developed by:

Richard Clark, Associate Dean
William Fanslow, Associate Professor
Atron Gentry, Professor
Robert Peterkin, Adjunct Lecturer
Philip Stec, Lecturer and Staff Associate
Brunetta Wolfman, Adjunct Professor

After Consultation with:

Mario Fantini, Dean
Robert Wood, Superintendent

Donald Boyd, Administrative Assistant, Madison Park High School
Michael Contompasis, Headmaster, Boston Latin School
Thomas Hennessey, Headmaster, Madison Park High School
George Johnson, Principal, Lewis Middle School
Stacey Johnson, Headmaster, Jamaica Plain High School
Chris Lane, Headmaster, Boston Latin Academy
William Lawrence, Headmaster, Boston English High School
Robert Murphy, Headmaster, Charlestown High School
Geraldine O'Donnell, Assistant Headmaster, Madison Park High School

Background

This new program derives from the collaboration begun in 1975 between the University of Massachusetts and the English High School in Boston. It is based on the assumption that individual schools within a system do make a difference for each of their students, and, moreover, that individual headmasters and their staffs are central to making the difference that supports and improves each student's intellectual, emotional, and social growth. Ultimately, success of the new program will be directly linked to improved student outcomes in each of the participating schools.

The new program is a collaborative effort between the University and the Boston Public Schools. Program planning and development will continue to be the product of shared thinking and discussions between University and Boston school participants. This process will be strengthened by recognition of the differing responsibilities and authority of individuals from the University and the Boston School System. Secondary school operation and policy are the domains of the Boston Public Schools. Graduate program and policies are the domains of the University. Both institutions can influence one another through discussion and negotiation.

Program Overview

The program will support individual school efforts in analysis, planning, implementation and evaluation for purposes of enhancing student outcomes. As stated previously, individual schools are a function of individual school leadership, the individual and collective behavior of expectations of the faculty, and the internal and external policies, practices, and climates that guide them. The program will focus on the individual

school--its leadership, faculty and students--as the primary unit of studies and action. Other issues will be considered to the extent that they relate to individual school performance.

Headmasters and other building administrators, whether oriented toward careers as leaders at the building level, or at other state or national levels seek achievement in and recognition for improving the quality of life and outcomes for the staff and students in their schools. They also must be secure in their current positions and mobile when seeking other positions. Particularly in their present assignments, building administrators must be able to efficiently manage day-to-day crises in order to focus primary energies on longer range planning and development. The program is designed to support these ends.

Teacher teams will be composed of diverse individuals who have entered the teaching profession at different times and with various motivations. All are now facing different, and probably more challenging, conditions compared with when they first entered the profession. The program provides teachers an opportunity to enhance their own professional status through efforts to increase the effectiveness of their own schools. This program, with graduate degree options, will support those teachers who choose to work with building administrators and the University.

In spite of varying degrees of criticism by students, parents and the general public, the Boston Secondary Schools have achieved a large measure of success in meeting educational challenges of the 1980's. Faculty and administrators deserve and expect recognition for their commitment, expertise, and previous successes. The schools, which are communities of people, seldom benefit from the attacks and public skepticism

to which they have been subjected. Rather, the schools must identify, capitalize on, and be recognized for their unique mission and achievements. This program is designed to support schools efforts to accomplish these goals.

The University of Massachusetts is the state's only public land grant institution. The School of Education is physically located in Amherst but it has programs throughout the Commonwealth, the country and the world. The School is committed to working with administrators and teachers, especially in urban areas, to improve individual outcomes for youth. Neither revenues nor enrollments generated by this program justify the time and number of University faculty involved. Rather, justification comes from the real expectations for school improvement, for the return of public faith in the effectiveness of urban public high schools, and of the possibilities that University and Boston Public School personnel can learn together in ways that may help others around the country. While the expectations and investments for this program are substantial, the potential for success is enormous.

Program Operation

Program participants will meet every Monday during the school year. Any exceptions will be announced in advance. These meetings will usually be held from 3-5:30 P.M. at the University of Massachusetts President's Office at 100 Arlington Street, Boston. The meetings can follow any of the following formats: all headmasters and all teachers in one group; headmasters in one group, teachers in another; headmasters and teachers in school groups; and multiple groups dictated by specific participant needs.

In addition, all headmasters will meet for two full days per semester,

and all team members for one full day per semester at the Amherst Campus. Also, school teams will meet in their schools each week for approximately two hours.

Monday meetings will vary between presentations and discussion with the entire group (all headmasters and team members); presentations and discussion with team members in one setting and headmasters in another; and school-based team meetings (each headmaster with his/her school team).

All team members will enroll for six credits of graduate course work throughout their participation in the program. Team members will also be encouraged to apply for admission to, and earn a Master's Degree, or, if they already hold a Master's Degree, they may seek admission and work toward a Certificate of Advanced Graduate Study (CAGS) from the University.

Headmasters and other building administrators serving as team leaders will enroll for nine credits of graduate course work throughout their participation in the program. Those not already in the CAGS or Ed.D. program will be encouraged to apply for admission.

The degree requirements for the M.Ed., CAGS. and Ed.D. are appended. It is the responsibility of the candidate to be aware of all admission and program requirements. The University will be responsible for insuring that faculty and course resources are available for team members who elect and are selected to pursue degrees.

Fall Semester, 1980-81 Academic Year

All participants will register for two courses: Education 713--Planning for Urban Schools, and Education 615--Workshop in Education. Team members will register for three credits in each. Headmasters and other team leaders will register for three credits in Education 713, and six credits in Education 615.

These two courses combined are designed to encourage and support serious school team efforts to improve individual school student outcomes. It is anticipated that second semester courses will build upon those offered in the Fall and that the level of involvement for participants will remain substantial.

In Education 713 participants will focus on three areas which will occupy the majority of the semester:

1) understanding of key results and other organizational development processes by which school teams may identify and clarify desired year-end outcomes for their schools, and identify short-term steps which may be taken toward achieving the outcomes:
2) review and study a recent longitudinal study of twelve inner-London secondary schools, reported in 15,000 Hours, Michael Rutter et al, to identify (a) selected areas of secondary school education worthy of study, and (b) review methods and models for collecting and analyzing information pertinent to these selected areas;
3) researching current literature and reported practices to suggest ideas and practices which may be pertinent to individual schools in moving toward specific student outcomes.

In Education 615 participants, working in school-based teams under administrative leadership, will apply concepts and practices learned and developed in Education 713. Activities may include weekly team meetings, administration of questionnaires, interviews and meetings with students, faculty, parents; observation of a variety of school activities; and the summary and analysis of administrative data, etc.

Degree Requirements

The graduate program with Boston Secondary Schools operates consistently with University and School of Education policies. All students are urged to read the Graduate Bulletin and the School of Education Graduate Handbook for detailed information. The following sections are clarifications specifically in relation to the Boston Secondary School Program.

All Degree Candidates

Because the graduate program is designed to assist and encourage participants to make changes, with other school team members, candidates for any degree will be expected to meet the following requirement: Each degree candidate must submit evidence that during the program period he or she has participated as an individual in the development, implementation, and evaluation of one or more new programs or practices designed to improve student outcomes of his/her school. (Note: This may be met either individually or with a team of participants, but in either case an individual statement will be required prior to the awarding of a degree. Evidence may be a dissertation, major paper, or other significant documentation.)

Doctor of Education Degree

Within the framework of Graduate School regulations, each student plans his/her own doctoral program with the advice of and subject to the approval of a Guidance Committee. The University of Massachusetts faculty participating in the program will provide their services as Guidance Committee members. As a student progresses, he/she may keep the original

committee, subject to faculty concurrence, or change it if interests change or different expertise is required.

Students are expected to spend at least two consecutive semesters in full-time residential study, under direct supervision of their committees, participate in conceptual or quantitative research efforts, engage in teaching and/or some form of field experience, become familiar with contemporary problems in education, and take a comprehensive examination prior to writing the dissertation. Also, doctoral students must register for eighteen dissertation credits after comprehensive examinations. No more than nine can be taken in one semester. Doctoral Forms 1-10 (Appendix 1) describe in more detail the specific steps and sequence in the doctoral program.

Master of Education Degree

The Master of Education Degree is offered for professional improvement of teachers, and for the training of educational specialists.

M.Ed. candidates must complete a thirty-three credit program which has been approved by their faculty advisor. Eighteen of these credits must be graded, twelve must be above the 600 number series, and a minimum of twenty-one credits must be taken through the School of Education.

M.Ed. students may transfer a total of six credtis taken as a University of Massachusetts non-degree student to be used toward their degree. A total of twelve credits may be transferred from another university if no courses were taken as a non-degree student. A student may combine credits from outside his/her program (for example, six non-degree plus six from another university would equal the twelve as long as the total credits does not exceed twelve). The transfer of credit requires

a memo from the Program Director to the Associate Dean of Graduate Affairs of the School of Education. The credits transferred must have a grade of B or better, though they do not count towards the graded or above 600 level requirement. Master's students must file a program of study approved by their advisor prior to submitting "Eligibility for a Master's Degree" forms.

C.A.G.S.

Programs leading to a Certification of Advanced Graduate Study are designed for persons who seek post-Master's Degree work. These require a minimum of thirty credit hours beyond the Master's Degree (the Master's Degree must not be more than ten years old). All thirty credits must be taken from the University of Massachusetts within a four-year period, and at least fifteen credits must be taken in the School of Education. Of all the course work leading to the Certificate, at least eighteen credits must be above the 600 level as listed in the Bulletin.

C.A.G.S. students must file a program of study approved by their advisor prior to submitting the "Eligibility for a Master's Degree" forms, which is also used for C.A.G.S. eligibility.

The advisor of records for all Master's and CAGS candidates in the program is Philip Stec.

Advising, Information, Communication

Program offices and information control are located on the 13th floor at 100 Arlington Street. Please use these resources. All questions, issues, and transactions regarding credit, fees, and billing should be

routed through this source. even where actions are in response to direct Graduate School communications.

APPENDIX B

Program Memorandum

SCHOOL OF EDUCATION
UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS
AMHERST

MEMORANDUM

FROM Richard J. Clark, Associate Dean DATE August 8, 1980
TO Michael Contompasis, Thomas Hennessey, Geraldine O'Donnell, Donald Boyd, Robert Murphy, George Johnson, William Lawrence, Chris Lane, Stacey Johnson
SUBJECT Orientation/Planning Meeting: Thursday, August 21, 3:00 P.M., UMass President's Office, 12th floor Conference Room, 100 Arlington Street

The UMass faculty team for our new program with you has been meeting in Boston and in Amherst during July and August, preparing for the start of the year. The team, William Fanslow, Atron Gentry, Robert Peterkin, Philip Stec, Brunetta Wolfman, and I, are prepared to present and discuss these plans with you on August 21.

Our agenda:

3:00 P.M.	Program Description and Discussion Status Report on School Teams The First Day and Registration
4:00 P.M.	Individual Meetings With Each of You Regarding Your Doctoral Progress
5:30 P.M.	Cocktails at Brunetta Wolfman's (Marlboro Street)
7:00 P.M.	Adjournment (Meeting of UMass faculty team)

Your attendance at this meeting is critical, as is your role in the program as a whole. If for any reason you cannot be there, please call me immediately (413-545-1574) and I will attempt to reschedule.

We look forward to seeing you and working with you throughout the coming year.

Thursday, August 21, 3:00 P.M.

RJC:djm

cc: UMass Faculty Team

APPENDIX C

Course Syllabi

University of Massachusetts School of Education -
Boston Secondary Schools Program

Syllabus, Fall Semester, 1980

Education 615: Workshop in Education 3-6 cr.
Education 713: Planning for Urban Schools 3 cr.

Faculty: Richard J. Clark
William V. Fanslow
Atron A. Gentry
Robert S. Peterkin
Philip J. Stec
Brunetta R. Wolfman

Note: Program Offices are at
250 Stuart Street.
Telephone: 482-8400 x140
Contact: Professor Stec

Prerequisites: Permission of faculty.
Registration for both courses together.
Participation is limited to team leaders or team members in the Boston Secondary Schools Program.

Overview: The two courses are designed to encourage and support serious efforts by school teams to improve individual school outcomes in student achievement and behavior. The two courses will also provide an opportunity for program planning and development in subsequent semesters.

Education 713: Planning for Urban Schools, will provide participants with knowledge and school assessment, program design, and implementation theories and practices.

Education 615: Workshop in Education, will require that participants apply the theories and practices developed in Education 713 to individual school settings. The primary focus will be on specific problems, issues, and action plans developed for individual schools.

Schedule: The courses will meet most Mondays during the semester. In addition, all participants will be expected to join the mini-sabbatical at Amherst, November 21-22. School teams will also meet in their schools on a regular basis each week.

Class meetings (all participants) will be held from 3:00-5:30 PM at 100 Arlington/250 Stuart Street on the following dates:

September 15	October 6	November 10	December 1
22	20	17	8
29	27		15

Class meetings will vary between and within sessions with all participants, separate meetings of team leaders and team members, and meetings of school teams.

Team meetings in individual schools will be scheduled by team leaders and members.

A mini-sabattical will be held in Amherst, November 21-22 (Friday-Saturday). Team leaders should plan schedules to be in Amherst from noon Friday through dinner Saturday. Team members should plan to be in Amherst from dinner (6 PM) Friday through noon on Saturday.

Semester Plan: Three phases of the program are anticipated for this semester.

Phase I: September - October

Problems and issues will be identified. School teams will generate sets of problems and issues which may warrant concentrated attention at the individual school level. Concurrently, all participants will study experiences of other schools and systems in an effort to identify which sets of problems and issues have the greatest potential, when solved or resolved, for improving student outcomes (academic and social).

Phase II: October - November

This phase will focus on organizational development processes. "Key results" for each school will be identified. Theories and approaches for achieving these "key results" will be explored.

Phase III: November - December

In Phase III specific plans for each school, and the group as a whole, will be developed. The mini-sabbatical will provide participants with an inventory of human and material resources which may be used in implementing their school plans.

Course Requirements:

1. attendance at all Monday sessions and the mini-sabbatical. (Necessary absences can be arranged, in advance, for up to 2 sessions, through Professor Stec.)
2. participation in school-based team meetings, as attested to by headmasters/team leaders.
3. participation in school-based team research, evaluation, and development efforts, as attested to by headmasters/team leaders.
4. completion of 2 papers:
   a. The Implications of Rutter's Fifteen Thousand Hours (and/or other readings) for _____ School. (5-10 pages, due November 3)
   b. The Application of a Key Results Process at _____ School: Processes and Results. (5-10 pages, due December 8)

OR

   c. Taking a Final Examination on December 15 related to (a) and (b) above.

Note: Headmasters/team leaders, in addition, will be expected to provide leadership to school-based teams; provide records of all team meetings; and meet individually twice during the semester with the UMass faculty team to present progress and issue reports.

Readings: A detailed bibliography will be distributed at the September 22 meeting.

For the September 22 meeting, all participants will be expected to read the conclusions of Rutter's Fifteen Thousand Hours. Copies are available in each school.

Important: All Monday classes will start with coffee served at 2:45 on the 13th floor. Faculty and participants will have a chance to visit, and room designations for class meetings will be made there at 3:00 sharp.

Faculty Advising: All faculty will be available for appointments with participants Please schedule through Professor Stec in Room 1322, telephone 482-8400 ext. 140.

COURSE OUTLINE
UMASS/BOSTON SECONDARY SCHOOLS PROJECT

Spring, 1981

Educ I 757: Research, Planning, and Development in Urban Education 3 credits
Educ I 856: Urban Administration and School Structures 3-6 credits (6 credits for team leaders)

Classes will be held Mondays, 3:00-5:30 at 250 Stuart Street and in participating schools by arrangement.

DESIRED OUTCOMES:

I...Key Results plans

- successful implementation in schools of each plan by each team
- identification of an evaluation team, development of an evaluation design, and successful evaluation of each school's plan(s)
- modification or redefinition of the Key Results plan

II...Creation of a Headmaster/Team Leader doctoral program support group with UMass faculty.

III...Extension of school problem solving-team concept to other faculty in each school.

IV...Broaden the scope of the project and the roles of school personnel to improve school outcomes.

- Organizational Development as a means to institutional improvement
- "Expectation Theory" as a means to understanding teacher-student-school relations
- Personal and Group Charisma and Leadership styles as a means to accomplish goals
- Developing project plans for the 1981-82 academic year.

READINGS:

Abt, Wendy; Reforming Schools: Problems in Program Implementation and Evaluation, Beverly Hills, Cal., Sate Public. 1980

Coleman, James S.; The Adolescent Society: The Social Life of the Teenager and Its Impact on Education, New York Free Press, 1961

Denham, Caroline and Lieberman, Ann; Time to Learn: A Review of the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study, Sacramento California, California Commission for Teacher Preparation and Licensing, 1980

Merton, Robert K., Social Theory and Social Structure, Glencoe Illinois Free Press, 1957

Murphy, Jerome; Getting the Facts: A Field Work Guide for Evaluators and Policy Analysts, Santa Monica California, Goodyear Publishing Company, 1980

United States Department of Health Education and Welfare (National Center for Educational Statistics); Longitudinal Study of the High School Class of 1972

REQUIREMENTS

- attendance and participation at all large group and team meetings
- attendance and participation at Mini-Sabbatical II at UMass
- an individual 5-10 page paper: "A Set of Desirable Key Results for _____", derived from a study of Organizational Development and Expectation Theory concepts.
- Development of a new set of Desirable Key Results for next year
- participation on an evaluation team

ORGANIZATION

The courses will meet on Mondays at 250 Stuart Street in large group, school teams, or evaluation teams. On selected Mondays, teams will meet in their own schools, starting at 2:00pm with UMass faculty. Team Leaders will also call meetings of school teams on own initiative.

DATES

February	March	April	May
2	2	3-4 (Mini-Sabbatical)	4
9	9	13	11
23		27	

TENTATIVE AGENDA

February 2:	Organizational -- Overview of Selected Organizational Development Concepts. 4:30pm - Headmaster/Team Leader Meeting
February 9:	Overview of the State of Research on"Expectation Theory". 4:30pm - Team Meetings 4:30pm - Headmaster/Team Leader Meetings
February 23:	Overview of Selected Evaluation Paradigms 4:30pm - Evaluation Teams Meet 4:30pm - Headmaster/Team Leader Meetings

March 2: UMass Faculty in Schools
2:00-4:00pm - Team Meetings in schools with UMass faculty to:
a) review Key Results plan re: selected readings
b) discuss individual Key Results plans
c) assist teams in plans for expanding their influence
4:30pm- Headmaster/Team Leader Meeting at 250 Stuart Street

March 9: Progress Reports from each School Team: Emphasis on Achievements and Obstacles.
4:30pm - Evaluation Teams meet and plan design

April 3-4 Mini Sabbatical at Amherst.
Arrival by 5:00pm Friday. Departure after Noon on Saturday.

Due for presentation at Mini-Sabbatical:
- Evaluation Team Preliminary Plans for next year
- Individual papers; "Desirable Key Results"
- Evaluation Teams will consult with Evaluation Experts. Individuals will videotape presentations. A 2:00am curfew will be rigidly unenforced.
- New material and research on secondary education.
- Introduction to various skill development strategies.

April 6: 3:00pm - at school site to be evaluated
- Evaluation Teams meet with Headmasters/Team Leaders and UMass faculty to present, discuss, and plan implementation of evaluation for each school and plans for next year.

April 13:
- no meeting
- Evaluation Teams conduct evaluation during this or preceding week

April 27: 3:00pm - Evaluation Team Meetings
4:00pm - Presentation of preliminary evaluation by each Evaluation Team

May 4: UMass faculty and Headmaster/Team Leaders present assessment of year and aspirations for 1981-82. Teams meet to discuss possible preliminary Key Results, 81-82.

May 11: Discussion of the need for personal and group charisma and leadership in implementing school improvement efforts.

APPENDIX D

Interview Questions

Participant Interview Questions

1. Could you begin by giving me some background on your team?

   How often do you meet?

   How long does a typical meeting take?

   Do your meetings ever run over?

2. How did you happen to become involved in the team?

   Have you participated in previous courses with U. Mass.?

3. What problem(s) is your team working on?

4. How did your team decide on working on that problem?

5. How did your team go about designing your plan of action?

   Has this approach been tried before?

   Were any other approaches discussed?

6. Were there any conflicts or debates about the problem to work on or the plan of action to take?

   How did your team resolve this conflict?

   Do people express differences of opinion during meetings?

7. How would you characterize the climate of your team meetings?

8. What do you think are some of the effects of your team involvement (for you? for your school? for other team members? for other teachers? students?)?

9. Who is the leader of your team?

   How was the leader chosen?

10. How would you characterize the leadership of your team?

11. Do other people in the school know about the work of your team? (Does the headmaster know?)

12. Has your team invited any outside resources to help with your work? What about any internal resources?

13. Have you or any other team member shared any resources? For example, articles, books, acquaintances, skills?

14. Do you get or give any feedback to members of your team?

15. Have you observed any new patterns of behavior, any new roles or procedures in your school as a result of the teams?

16. Has your plan of action succeeded? What criteria did your team develop to evaluate its progress?

17. Does your team have any long-range goals? Will you continue working on these teams next year? What is the sense of commitment on the team?

18. Has the work with the teams been satisfying? Frustrating? Why?

19. What satisfies you most about your work on the team?

20. Is there anything you want to add that we haven't discussed?

Interview Questions: Headmasters Non-Participants

1. How did the U.Mass. Program with the teams get started here?

2. Who is the leader of the team from your school?

3. How would you characterize the leadership of the team?

4. How many people are on the team?

5. What problem(s) is the team working on?

6. Have you seen any effects on the school because of the work of the team?

7. Have you attended any team meetings? How do you communicate with the team?

8. How did the team decide on the problem they are working on?

9. Does the team use any outside resources?

10. Why did you choose not to join the team?

11. Have you been involved with the U.Mass program before?

12. If you were in charge of this team program, what would you do?

13. Are there any additional comments you wish to make?

Interview Questions: University Faculty

1. What do you perceive as the long-range goals of this Program?

2. What made you get involved with this Program? What did you get out of the Program this year?

3. What effects do you see in the schools so far? What have the teams accomplished?

4. Do you have any additional comments?

APPENDIX E

Correspondence to Participants

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MADISON PARK HIGH SCHOOL

THOMAS P. HENNESSEY
Headmaster

Dear_____,

Mary Schatzkamer from U. Mass and I have been collaborating on a research project on the Boston Secondary School Project. We are collecting data on the school-based teams to try to determine what factors impact on the effectiveness of the teams. We are presently conducting interviews and observing team meetings. Your name was chosen through a random selection to be an interviewee.

Would you please mail the enclosed post card to me indicating a time during which you could be interviewed or call me at Madison Park if you are willing to participate? The interview takes approximately forty-five (45) minutes.

All participants in this dissertation study will have access to the data bank at the discretion of Dr. Richard Clark.

Please give me a call or leave a message as to when I can see you at your school.

Your cooperation is most appreciated.

Sincerely,

Gere O'Donnell

Gere O' Donnell
445 2440 Ext. 406

Enclosure

55 NEW DUDLEY STREET • BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS 02119 • 445-2440 AREA 617

Permission Form

I hereby agree to participate in the research project on the Boston Secondary Schools Program.

I understand that research will be conducted using the following methods:

- questionnaire to all participants;
- interviews with headmasters, team leaders and some team members;
- observation of the process of team meetings.

I understand that all data will be held under the jurisdiction of the University staff and will be accessible to me at their discretion.

Signed_____

Telephone Number_____

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MADISON PARK HIGH SCHOOL

May 19, 1981

THOMAS P. HENNESSEY
Headmaster

Dear _____:

I am presently collecting data for a dissertation study of the University of Massachusetts, Amherst Project known as the Boston Secondary Schools Program. I am trying to determine the conditions or variables which have an impact on the effectiveness of the school-based teams which were set up in September, 1980 as two courses for Boston teachers and administrators with the School of Education.

Since you were a participant on your school team during one or both of the semesters, would you kindly take the time to fill out the enclosed questionnaire and return it to me in the stamped envelop provided?

Your cooperation is truly appreciated.

Thanks!

Sincerely,

Gere O'Donnell

Gere O'Donnell
445-2440, #406

55 NEW DUDLEY STREET • BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS 02119 • 445-2440

THE SCHOOL COMMITTEE OF THE CITY OF BOSTON

BOSTON PUBLIC SCHOOLS
MADISON PARK HIGH SCHOOL

THOMAS P HENNESSEY
Headmaster

June 16, 1981

Dear Colleague,

I would like to take this opportunity to express my sincere appreciation for the excellent cooperation which all of you extended to me in my study of the school-based teams and the U. Mass Amherst program.

You helped to make this experience a very enlightening one in sharing your professional expertise and also a very pleasurable one in getting to know so many more great people in this system of ours.

I wish you a wonderful summer and sincerely hope we can continue our work together in this worthwhile program.

Sincerely,

Geraldine O'Donnell

Geraldine O' Donnell
Assistant Headmaster

55 NEW DUDLEY STREET • BOSTON MASSACHUSETTS 02119 • 445-2440

APPENDIX F

Written Questionnaires

The purpose of this questionnaire is to collect data from all team participants anonymously to help answer one basic question: what are the conditions or variables which have an impact on the effectiveness of the school teams? Your thoughtful responses are greatly appreciated.

1. How many years have you been a teacher and/or administrator?____
2. What is your highest degree? _____ Number of credits beyond?____
3. Have you participated in the U.Mass program before?_____
4. If yes, for how many semesters? _____
5. How long have you been involved in your school team?_____
6. Are you a team leader or member? _____

Please read each statement on the left and check the box on the right to indicate the most appropriate response to you:

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
7. The team design has helped to integrate my own educational needs with the school needs.					
8. Everyone participates equally on our team.					
9. The goals of our team are clear to me.					
10. The work on the team has had a positive impact on my work.					
11. The team gives me more access to administrators/ teachers.					
12. I can depend on my team members for support.					
13. The work of our team has improved conditions at school.					
14. Being on the team has given me new insights into school issues.					
15. Being on the team has helped me to communicate more with others.					
The following statements pertain to the team meetings:					
16. Everyone has a chance to speak before our team makes decisions.					
17. Some team members do more talking at meetings than others.					
18. People listen to one another at our meetings.					
19. Team members are concerned about the needs of one another.					
20. Differences of opinion are discussed openly at meetings.					
21. We use an agenda at meetings.					

22. Please check off as many of the following descriptions which you think characterize your team:

____ a course requirement
____ a support group
____ a participatory management team
____ an advisory committee for the headmaster
____ a problem-solving group
____ a leadership team for the school
____ a headmaster's inner circle
other _____

23. What are some of the things you liked best about the team?

_____

_____

24. What are some of the things which you liked the least?

_____

_____

25. What changes would you make for this team approach?

_____

_____

26. In addition to the changes noted in #25, please list things that need to happen to make your work as a school team more effective:

_____

_____

_____

_____

27. What is the basic category for your work at school as a teacher or administrator?

____ an interruption
____ a job
____ an occupation
____ a career
____ a vocation

THANK YOU

FOR TEACHERS OR TEAM MEMBERS ONLY

28. Is your headmaster also your team leader? ____

29. Would you describe your relationship with your headmaster as most like:

____ a boss to a subordinate
____ a colleague
____ a helper
____ a pal
____ an equal
____ a close friend
____ other _____

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Undecided	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
30. The team leader sets an example by working hard.					
31. The team leader gives everyone a chance to talk.					
32. The team leader's ideas are questioned and debated.					
33. The team leader's ideas are rejected.					
34. The team leader shares new ideas.					
35. The team leader tries to involve all members in discussions.					
36. The team leader gives clear directions.					

37. How would you characterize the leadership of your team?

____ authoritarian
____ laissez-faire
____ democratic
other _____

THANK YOU